A FRIENDLY CAVEAT TO IRELANDS CATHOLICKES,

concerning the daungerous Dreame of Christs *corporall (yet invisible) presence in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.*

GROVNDED VPON A LETTER PRETENded to be sent by some well minded Catholickes: who doubted, and therefore desired satisfaction in certaine points of religion,

With the aunswere and prooffes of the Romane Catholicke Priests, to satisfie and confirme them in the same.

Peruſed and allowed for Apoſtolicall and Catholicke, by the ſubſcription of maiſter *Henry Fitzſimon* Ieſuit, now priſoner in the Caſtle of Dublin.

With a true, diligent, and charitable examination of the ſame prooffes: wherein the Catholickes may ſee *this newe Romane doctrine to bee neither Apoſtolicall nor Catholicke, but cleane contrarie to the old Romane religion, and therefore to bee ſhunned of all true auncient Romane Catholickes, vnleſſe they will be new Romiſh heretickes.*

By Iohn Rider Deane of Saint Patrickes Dublin.

ROM. 10. 1. 2.

Brethren, mine hearts deſire and praier to God for Iſrael, is, that they might be ſaved. For I beare them record, that they haue the zeale of God, but not according to knowledge.

DVBLIN
Printed by Iohn Franckton. 1602.

TO THE RIGHT HONOVRABLE S. CHARLES BLVNT, BARON MOVNTIOY: KNIGHT OF THE most noble Order of the Garter: Governor of her Maiesties Towne of Portesmouth and Isle of Portesea: Lord Deputie of the Realme of Ireland, & Generall of all her Ma. forces there. And to the rest of the privie Councell.

Vrt de Pascolo in anlico suo politico, page 146. right Honourable, being a wise courtier & a frendly Councellor, advised al petitioners to Princes and to men of State, not to tender their suits in vnseasonable times, *Sed id deferat auribus eius, nullo alio negotio defatigatis ne labor vel sit imperfectus vel Inanis.* *Pascolus* his counsell is good, yet I may not follow it: he was an old Courtier seasoned with experience, yet his direction at this time I may not embrace. For if I should not present these papers vnto your learned & honourable censures, before such times as

your heads were free from publike cares, and your persons at rest from her Maiesties service, I should sooner write tenne such; then find time to present one such. And though the day affoords no leisure to survey it, yet often it falleth out, that cares in the day banish sleep in the night: And as it fell out with the great Monarch of whom the scriptures record, *Noctem illam duxit Rex insomnem*: so it may happen that though your leasures will be little in the day, so your sleep may be lesse in the night. And as that mightie Prince called for his Chronicles when hee could not sleep; so your Honours and Worshippes would be pleased to peruse this small treatise, when your common cares banish desired rest. And though *Nocturnæ lucubrationes* (if violent) be most daungerous, yet being moderatly vsed they cause (as wee imagine) the watch to *wheele* the faster, and the clocke to strike the sooner. Two reasons haue emboldned me to present it to this Ho. Senate: the one that without checke of ill disposed, it may boldly and plainlie

Ester.6.1.

plainlie shew to the world with what wrelling of Scriptures, wringing of fathers, and alleadging of fables and munkish miracles, the queenes subiects haue been so long deceived by Romish Priests, and yet vnder the colour of Catholicke religion: The second reason is, that your Honours seeing the manner of our combat, may witnesse to all men, that if they be beaten with their owne weapons, they haue no cause to brag of anie victorie to their favorits, nor complaine of any iniurie against me. For I haue dealt with the Romane Priests, as the Pilgrime Spaniard exhorted the Princes of Christendome to deale with the Castilian king, That if ever they would tame the proud, bloudie, and insolent Spaniard, they should fight with him at home in his owne countrie in Spaine: for one blow at home, doth more discourage his subiects, daunt his Mercenaries, maleconteth his confederates, and displotteth his purposes, then twentie ouerthrowes abroad: the one is visible, and therefore sensible and terrible, but the o-

In his Tratado paranatico, pag 8. 9.

ther is so masked by lying Friers & Popish Pilgrims, & seditious Seminaries, that the king of Spaine hath ten foiles abroad, before the subiect heares one truth at home. This course I haue taken with the Priests, because I would discouer the weakenesse of poperie to the best minded Catholicks: I haue gone home to them to their owne doores, fought with them within their own lists, at their own weapons, in the presence of their best friends, with their own translations, Fathers, Popes, Canons, Texts, and Glosses: and if they be foiled at their own weapons, then the best minded may see the weakenesse of their owne cause. And whereas this small labour hath manie enemies of severall peevish humours, some condemned the whole worke of it, before ever they saw one word in it: others threatned it death before it had life. In the first remaineth envie & indiscretion, for such as will censure before they see, are like such wise men as will shoot their bolt assoone at a bush as at a bird. In the second remaines malice, against which, & whom if it canno

defen-

defend it selfe with canonicall scriptures, auncient Fathers, and the practise of the Primitiue Church, as becommeth a true Apostolicall Catholicke: then let them vse their old woodden arguments, and burne it as an heretickе. But seeing it had enemies before it was borne, I knowe it will haue moe now it is abroad: becausе books are like ships at sea: for as the one is subiect to all weathers, so the other to all censures. Therefore in trembling presumption I intreat your Ho. favours, shield, and protection, that though it were cõdemned before it was, and may be now rent before it be read: yet that before it be iudiciallie condemned, it may plead in your presence like a subiect for it selfe, and according to the equitie of the cause, and the qualitie of the evidence, receiue your Honours learned and graue sentence (yet with all favour.) Which if you graunt, though the worke bee simple, I doubt not of the good successe, if trueth may take place. The which patronage of the cause, & pardon for my boldnesse being obtained, I

will

will not ceaſe to praiſe God for thoſe honorable victories againſt the inſolet Spaniards, & periured rebels, in this your Honours godlie & politicke government atchieved: but alſo daily pray that you may not onely ſuppreſſe rebellion, but abādon ſuperſtition: plant in the Church truth, and in the commonwealth peace: for ſubiection without religion is but temporizing: & till religion be ſeated in the heart, look for no ſound ſubiection generally & perpetuallie in the land: For *Peter* told trueth when he ſaid, *Feare God honor the king:* and the lacke of this feare of God & true religion, hath ſpent England ſo much bloud, and the queene in her gracious raigne ſo much money, as the tenth part of both ioyntly at one time imployed, would haue conquered Spaine, and ſackt Rome. The Lord bleſſe her Ma. vnder whom you moſt happily & proſperouſly governe, & grant that the worlds doome & her death may meet in one day. From my houſe in ſaint *Patricks* cloſe, Dublin this 14 of Sep. 1601.

The Lords moſt vnworthie
ſervant I. R.

To all Romane Priests, and all other of *ane other Romish order, vntruly surnamed* Catholicke Priests: and to everie of them *within the kingdome of Ireland,*

IF the Irish Testament (a godly laborious and profitable worke to Gods Church) had not inbusied the Printers Presse: long before this time, my *Friendlie Caueat* had presented it selfe to your friendly censures. I haue onelie handled the first position, and could goe no further in the rest, till the Printers returne from London with new letters: and whereas there be some faults escaped, impute them not to the skilfull Printer, but to the stumpeworne letter: for as weapons vnsteeled cut not, so letters overworne print not. I haue laid downe your proosses and speeches touching the first position, not adding, diminishing, or altring one sillable or letter: but as I received them by a courteous Gentleman (I thinke a Priest) and as maister *Henry Fitzsimon* subscribed the same, approoving them to be Apostolicall and Catholicke: so I haue delivered them, onely the Preface I scilence, till I know your further pleasure, because it is too byting and bitter, relishing rather of malice then matter. But if you mislike with this scilence, vpon the least notice, my next Treatise shall manifest it to the world by way of a Postscript, to which I will annex a Rescript. And whereas your letter directed vnto me at first, was subscribed in stead of your names, *Catholicke Priests*, I haue therefore not knowing your names, given you still the same titles. But I must tell you plainlie, you haue onelie the names without the trueth of the thing it selfe: which vaine vsurped titles you must cast off, vntil you can proove your doctrine Catholick: for a Catholicke opinion without an Apostolical warrant, is fitter termed vpstart heresie, then Catholicke divinitie.

your Preface concerneth nothing the matter in question

Read Vincent. Lirinens. adversus haereses, and you shall see what Catholick is.

divinitie. But this is moſt ſure, that you haue forſaken the veritie of Chriſts Goſpell, and the faith of the Primitiue Church: to prooue it but in this one point of our queſtion. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *Ideo Dominus abſcentauit ſe corpore omni eccleſia, &c.* Therefore the Lord (Chriſt) abſented himſelfe touching his bodilie preſence from everie Church, and aſcended into heaven that our faith might be edified. Brag now no more of Chriſts corporall preſence to be in your Church; if you doe, wee with *Auguſtine* will ſay you haue no true Church. And againe, as you will haue a corporall preſence, ſo you teach the communicants to receiue Chriſt with their mouths corporallie, not with their faith ſpirituallie: contrarie to the opinion of *Auguſtine*, ſhewing the manner how Chriſt is to be eaten in the ſacrament foure times togither ſaith, *ſpiritualiter*, ſpirituallie, ſpirituallie. And you cannot ſhew one auncient writer that ſpeaking of the manner of our eating Chriſt in the Sacrament, that ſaith once corporallie. And therefore ſeeing this ancient Father condemneth your faith, and contradicts your doctrine, forſake new Romes hereſie, and returne to old Romes religion. But you will ſay, it is ſhame for me to belie the holie Sea, whoſe doctrine is Apoſtolicall, and their life Angelicall. My prooffes ſhall be your owne friends. *Lindanus* ſpeaketh of an ancient complaint of *Agobertus* Biſhop of *Lions*, who ſaid, *Antiphonarium magna ex parte correximus, amputatis quæ ſuperflua, leuia, falſa, blaſphema, phantaſtica multa videbantur.* We haue the moſt part corrected the Antiphonarie, cutting off thoſe which ſeemed ſuperfluous, light, falſe, blaſphemous, and manie phantaſticall things. Behold now the puritie of the doctrine of the Church of Rome, who dare venture his ſoule vpon ſuch ſandie ſuperſtition? nay, wicked & damnable hereſie & irreligion. And for the *life* of your Clergy in Rome, heare ſome of your own friends ſpeak their know-

Serm 140. de tempo. fol. 297. col. 3.

Super Ioh. Tract. 26. pag. 174. col. 4.

Vide non dente.

Read *Aug ſuper. Ioh. tract. 25, 26. & 50.*

The third booke, cap. 3. de interpretandis ſcripturis, pag. 102. Colen print. 1588

Then it ſeemeth ſome groſſe faits remain ſtil

knowledge. Read *Concilium delectorum Cardinalium*, *Concil. Tom. 3. pag.* 823. there thus you shall find it speaking of Rome. *In hac etiam vrbe, meretrices vt matronæ incedunt per vrbem seu mula vehuntur: quas affectantur de media die nobiles, Cardinalium familiares, Clericique. Nulla in vrbe vidimus hanc corruptionem præterquam in hac, omnium exemplari.* That is to say, In this cittie of Rome the curtisans or common whoores passe through the streets or ride on their mules like honest matrones. And in the middest of the day, the Noblemen, the Cardinals deare friends, and Priestes attend vppon those whoores. We never saw such corruption but onelie in this cittie of Rome, which is an example to all other cities. The Popes owne Cardinals beeing appointed by Pope *Paul* the third, *anno Dom.* 1538. to visit the cleargie and the stewes, returne this shamefull commission. But perchance you will tell the Queenes subiects, that these whoores dwel in some blind Alley, but the Popes court & pallace are a most holie sanctuarie of saints. No saith *Luitprandus* your own Proctor, *lib. 6. cap. 6. Ivo Laterense palatium sanctorum quondam hospitium erat, nunc est prostibulum meretricum.* The verie Popes pallace at *Lateran* sometimes was the harbour of holie Saints, but is now become a filthie stewes of common whoores. Now you see the Popes religion, & the Popes life; the one false, the other lewd: forsake both, defend neither, for if you doe, *Primasius ad Rom. cap.* 2. will tell you, *Nemo periculosius peccat, quam qui peccata defendit.* No man sinneth more dangerously, then he that pleadeth in the defence of sin. And your friend *Bernard* tells the Pope *Eugenius* to his face, that for his supremacie & vsurping both swords, he holds them *non Apostolicè*, not by Gods law. And that his priests in shew serue Christ, but in deed Antichrist. And elsewhere he painteth out the Popes Cleargie, that there is with them *meretricius Nitor, &c.* they be trimmed like whoors, attired

Bern. in all his fiue bookes de consideral. Serm. 33. vppon the Cant. pag. 141.

tired like plaiers, & serued like princes: but in life they are murderers, whoormaisters, bribers, and deceiuers. And if the Pope then was an vsurper of his supremacie, and cõdemned for his *Ambidextership*: what man of any reasonable sence, would embrace this religion that is so false, or commend this Romish cleargie whose liues are so filthie. And now Gentlemen, I wonder you insome not the subiects of the dangerous plots the Pope and Spaniard practise against thẽ: the one hath drawn them to ydolatrie, & the other inciteth whom he can to treacherie. And if Spaine might haue his will of this kingdome (but he is liker to loose Spaine then conquer Ireland) the subiects should be vsed as the Dukedome of *Millain* & the kingdome of *Naples* are by the Spaniards hãdled: al the Nobilitie & Gentlemẽ vpõ pain of death are forbidden to dwel in Castles: & the citizens in high streets, but back-laines: & no man to wear a weapõ, but a knife of three inches lõg, yet tipt with a French point, *Nopoynt*. This should be the miserable state of the Irish vnder bloudie Spaines government. Now for conclusion, let me intreat you as *August.* did his Readers, *Nolimeas literas ex tua opinione vel contentione, &c.* neither reproue nor correct these labors according to your own priuate opinion, or contentious humors, but correct & confute thẽ *lectione diuina*, by Gods word, & then you shal haue my good leaue & loue (& my best furtherance to the State that after you haue replied to this, it may be printed, as also your persons for further conference protected) & the like I desire of you, that whẽ you find the text & truth against you, you seek not any lying glosse or Romish shift to help you, rather contending for victory then veritie. The Lord open your eies that you may see the truth, that you & we ioyntlie & ioyfully may preach *onely* Christ crucified, without mans inventions, &c.

Poperie seeketh to bring Ireland to Spanish slaverie, from English libertie.

In his Preface before the third booke de Trinitate.

Your loving friend, so far as you are Christs & the Queens. Iob. Rider.

A FRIENDLY CAVEAT TO IRELANDS CATHOLICQUES, CONCERning the Daungerous Dreame of Christs corporall presence in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper: grounded vpon a letter sent from the Catholicques, &c.

To the reuerend Fathers, the holy Iesuits, Seminaries, and all other Priests that fauour the holy Romane religion within the kingdome of Ireland.

HVmbly praieth your Fatherly charities, F. W. and P. D. with many other professed Catholicques of the holie Romane religion: that whereas of late they haue heard some Protestant Preachers confidently affirme, and (as it seems vnto our shallow capacities) plainly do prooue, that these positions here vnder-written cannot be proued by anie of you, to be either Apostolicall or Catholicque by canonicall Scripture, or the auncient Fathers of the Church which liued and writ within the compasse of the first fiue hundred yeares after Christs ascension: which assertion of theirs, hath bred in your suppliants great doubts touching the trueth of the same: vnlesse your fatherly accustomed charities be extended presently to satisfie our consciences in the same, by the holy *written* word of God, & such Fathers of the Church as aforesaid, which being so directly and plainely prooued by you (as aforesaid) may be a speedie meanes to conuert many Protestants

to our profession, Otherwise, if these points cannot be so proued by you, vpon whose learned resolutions we greatly relie, then not onely we, but many thousands more in this kingdome of Ireland, can hold these points to be neither Apostolicall or Catholicque. And thus hauing shewed some of our doubts, wee desire your fatherly resolutions, as you tender the credit of our religion, the conuincing of the Protestants, and the satisfying of our poore consciences. And thus craving your speedie learned and fatherly answeres in writing, at or before the first of Februarie next, with a perfect quotation of both Scripture and Fathers themselues, not recited or repeated by others for our better instruction: and the aduersaries speedier & stronger confutation, we cõmend your persons and studies to Gods blessed direction and protection.

Positions.

1 *That Transubstantiation, or the corporall presence of Christs bodie and blood in the Sacrament, was neuer taught by the auncient fathers that euer writ in the first fiue hundred yeare after Christs ascension, but a spirituall presence onely to the faithfull beleeuers.*

2 *That the Church of God had not their seruice in an vnknowne tongue, but in such language as euery particuler Church vnderstood.*

3 *Thirdly, that Purgatorie and prayers for the dead were not then knowne in Gods Church.*

4 *Fourthly, that images & praying to Saints were then neither taught by those Fathers, nor receiued of the Catholicque Church.*

5 *Fiftly, that the Masse which now the Church of Rome vseth, was not then knowne to the Church.*

6 *Sixtly, that there ought not to bee one supreame Bishop ouer all the world, and that Bishop to be the Pope of Rome: and that the said Pope hath not vniuersall iurisdiction*

iurisdiction ouer all Princes, and their subiects, in all causes Temporall and Ecclesiasticall.

The Protestant Preachers affirme, vnles you prooue the premisses by canonicall Scripture, they cannot be Apostolicall: and therefore bind not the conscience of anie. And if they cannot bee proued by the said Fathers, then they be neither auncient nor Catholike: And therefore to be reiected as mens inventions.

PRouoked to prooue either by Scriptures, or Fathers, vvhich liued vvithin the compasse of fiue hundred yeares after Christs ascention, that the Primitiue Church and Catholicques of this time are of consent touching these Articles. Catho. Priests.

1 *That Christ is really in the blessed Sacrament.*
2 *That Scriptures should not be perused by the vulgar.*
3 *That praier for the dead & Purgatorie vvas beleeved.*
4 *That images vvere vvorshipped, and praiers made to Saints.*
5 *That Masse vvas allovved.*
6 *That the supremacie of the Pope vvas acknovvledged.*

GEntlemen: the cause of this your provokement was a quiet and milde conference vpon these positions, with an honorable Gentleman (and a speciall good friend of yours concerning religion) wherein he confidently affirmed, that the Iesuits and Romane Priests of this kingdome, were able to prooue by Scriptures and Fathers, these Positions to be Apostolicall & Catholicque. And that the Church of Rome and the Romane Catholicques in Ireland now hold nothing touching the same, but what the holy Scriptures and primitiue Fathers held within the first fiue hundred yeares after Christs ascention. Now if you in this conference for your part, haue made such Rider. maister W. N.

 proofe

proofe by the holy canonicall Scriptures, and such Doctors of the Church as aforesaid, I haue promised to become a Romane Catholicque: if you haue failed in your proofe (which I am assured you haue done) he likewise before worshipfull witnesses hath giuen his hand, to renounce this your new doctrine of the church of Rome, & become a professor of the gospel of Christ.

This was the occasion and maner of your prouokement, which I hope the best minded will not mistake, nor you misconster, being onelie prouoked by your friend, yea & faith (if you refuse not Saint *Peters* counsell) to be readie alwaes to giue an answere to euie man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you. In your first line you chaunge a woord, (*and* for *or*,) which greatly altereth the Catholickes question, and is farre from our first meaning. For we hold with Christs trueth, that vnlesse the written word of God first warrant it, we are not bound in conscience to beleeue it, though all the Doctors and Prelates in the world should weare it. And this was demaunded of you, not as the demaunders doubted that the canonicall Scriptures were insufficient to prooue any article of faith; but onelie, that all men might see and so be resolved, whether the Protestants, or the now Romane Catholicques ioyne neerest to Christs trueth and the faith of the first primitiue Fathers. For that faith which can bee prooued to bee taught in Christs time, and so receiued and continued in the primitiue Church for the first fiue hundred yeares after Christs ascention, must needs be the true, auncient, Apostolicall, and Catholicque faith. And that other faith that cannot be so proued, is but base, bastardly, and counterfeit; and I trust in Christ, that the Reader easily shall perceiue before the ende of this small Treatise, that this your opinion touching Christs carnall presence in the Sacrament, (and so in the rest of the other Po-

1. *Pet.* 3. 15

Iob. 20. 31.

sitions)

stions) was never taught by Christ, nor once dreamed on by the auncient Fathers, but invented and devised a thousand yeares after Christ, by the late Church of Rome: grounding their proofes onelie of an emptie sound of syllables, without Apostolicall or Catholicque sence: enforcing both Scriptures and Fathers to speake what they and you pleased, not what the holie Ghost and the Fathers purposed.

But first, heere you wrong your selfe much, your cause more, but the simple people most of all, in altering the state of the question: for our controversie is of the *manner* of Christs presence in the Sacrament: whether he be there corporallie or spiritualle. And you (no doubt in your conscience knowing it vnpossible to prooue your carnall presence) alter the question (verie deceiptfully) from the *manner* to the *matter*: *That Christ is really in the blessed Sacrament*: A thing never denied by vs, nor ever in question betwixt Protestant and Papist; for both you and we hold Christs reall presence in the Sacrament, but you carnallie and locallie: we misticallie and spiritually; you by Transubstantiation: we in the commanded and lawfull administration.

The Catholicque Priests subtilly alter the state of the question.

But here you forget your grounds of divinintie, and rules of Logicke, in making an opposition betwixt spirituall receiving and reall receiving, opposing them as contraries, whereas the opposition is not betwixt spirituall and reall, but betwixt corporall and spirituall: for spirituall receiving by faith is reall receiving, and corporall receiving by the mouth, is also reall receiving: So that the Scriptures and Fathers that here you alleadge, bee altogither impertinent to prooue your carnall presence of Christ and his new conception, of bread; not of the blessed Virgin; by a sinfull Priest, not by the holy Ghost. For Christ willing I will make it plaine vnto you, that you haue shewed

little divinitie, and concealed much learning in this: onely hudled vp a number of texts of Scriptures and Testimonies of Fathers out of *Eckius* Common-places, and other like *Enchiridions*, and neuer read the fathers themselues, which at first was requested.) And thus trusting other mens reports, and not your owne eyes: you haue wronged your self, weakned your cause, and abused the simple. For if you had diligently read & throughly weighed these Scriptures and Fathers, you might haue seene and knowne that these confute your erroneous opinons, and confirme them not.

But this you should haue here prooued for the Catholique's satisfaction, (in which you haue altogither failed.) That after the Priest hath spoken ouer and
Rhem. test. 1. Cor. 11. Coll. 9. the Bread and Wine, *Hoc est corpus meum*, and vsed powrefull words ouer it and the, which you call your consecration: that presentlie the substances of Bread and Wine are gon, not one crumme or drop remaining, but wholly transubstantiated, transmutated, and chaunged into the verie reall, naturall, and substantiall bodie and bloud of Christ, which was borne of
Rhe. Test. matth. 26. Coll. 4. the Virgin *Marie*, and nailed on the crosse, & is now in heaven: and yet in the Sacrament, whole, aliue, and immortall; and that this bodie of Christ must bee receiued with our corporall mouth, and locally descend into our corporall stomackes. Which bodie so made by the Priest, is offered by the Priest to God the father, as a propitiatorie, mercifull, and redeeming sacrifice, by which the Priest applieth (as his faith) the generall vertues of Christs passion to euery perticuler mans necessitie, either quicke or dead, for matters temporall, or graces spirituall, for whom and when he listeth, and for what hee pleaseth. Your carnall presence shall bee first handled. The second point, which is your propitiatorie sacrifice, shall bee handled in the title of the Masse. This is your Romane

ture learning which you should haue prooved: but how, your owne proofes (being duely examined) disprooue you, let the learned iudge. But now to your first proofe out of the sixth of Iohn, to prooue your opinion touching the first position.

Ioh. 6. vers. 51. *The bread vvhich I vvill giue is my flesh, &c.* Catho.
53. *Vnlesse you eate the flesh of the Son of man and drinke his bloud, you shal haue no life in you.* Priests.
55. *My flesh is meat truly, & my bloud is, &c.*

GEntlemẽ you mistake vtterly Christs meaning, wresting Christs wordes from the spirituall sence in which he spake, to the litterall sence which he never meant, ancient Fathers never taught, Primitiue Church of Christ for one thousand yeares atleast after Christs ascentiõ never knew or received. For the words and phrases be figuratiue and allegorical, therefore the sence must be spirituall, not carnal. Rider.

For this is a generall rule in Gods booke, ancient Fathers, yea and in your Popes Canons and glosses, that everie figuratiue speech or phrase of Scripture must be expounded spirituallie, not carnally or litterallie, as anone more plainlie you shall heare.

But that the simple be no longer seduced by your Romane doctrine, expounding this 6. of Iohn grammaticallie, and carnally, contrarie to Christs meaning, constraining these places to prooue your carnall presence of Christ in the Sacrament, when there was no Sacrament then ordained. I will set downe (GOD willing) Christs meaning truelie and plainlie which you shall not be able either by Scriptures or auncient Fathers to contradict.

1 First, I will plainelie deliver the occasion why Christ vsed the Metaphor of Bread, calling himselfe Bread.

2 Second-

2 Secondlie, according to which of Christs natures he is our living bread, whether as hee is man onely, or God onely; or as he is compleate God and man.

3 Thirdly, how this bread must be taken and eaten, whether by the mouth of the bodie or the mouth of the soule.

4 Fourthly, the fruit that comes to the true eaters thereof.

5 Lastly, the reasons shall bee alleadged out of Christs owne words, to prooue that your round Wafer-cakes vpon your supposed hallowed Altars, are not that true bread (Christs flesh) which Christ heere speakes of.

2. Occasiō *The question vvas mooued by some Bellie-gods that tasted of Christs banquet, & bountie (in feeding fiue thousand men vvith fiue loaues and tvvo fishes) vvhether Moses or Christ vvere the more excellent and liberall in feeding men.*

1 FIrst, they commend *Moses* from the greatnesse of his place and person, being Gods Lieutenant to conduct Israel out of Egypt.

2 Secondly, they commend their Manna from the place whence it came, which was the heavens as they supposed.

3 Thirdly, they commend the bread from the vertue of it; which was, it fed their Fathers in the drie sandie and barren wildernesse, and saved them from famine, & therfore they thoght that no man was greater thē *Moses*, no bread to be compared with Manna.

Now Christ by way of opposition and comparison confutes them: opposing God to *Moses*, and himselfe to Manna:

1 First, denieth that *Moses* was the giver of that Manna, but that God was the authour, *Moses* onely the Minister.

2 Secondly,

2 Secondlie, that it came not from the eternall kingdome of God, which is properlie called heaven, but from the visible clouds improperly called heaven.

3 Thirdlie, Christ denieth Manna to bee the true bread, because it onelie preserved life temporall, but could not giue it: but this bread (Christ) doeth not onelie giue life corporall, but also life spirituall in the kingdome of grace, & life eternall in the kingdome of glorie.

4 Fourthlie, this bread Manna ceased when they came into Canaan, and could no more bee found: but this bread (Christ) doth feed vs heere in this earthlie wildernesse, and raignes for ever with his triumphant Church in our everlasting & glorious Canaan the kingdome of heaven. Iosue. 5. 12

5 This bread Manna, & so all corporall meates when they haue fed the bodie, they haue performed their office, they perish without yeelding profit to the soule: but this bread of life (Christ) is the true bread, which once beeing received into the soule, doth not onelie assure and giue vnto it eternall life, but also to the bodie like assurance of resurrection & salvation, so that the soule must first feed on Christ, before the body can haue any benefit by Christ: contrarie to your doctrine, which is, that the bodie must first feed on Christ carnally, then the soule shal be thereby fed spiritualie. Ioh. 6. 54

And because they were so addicted in *Moses* time to Manna: in Christs time to his miraculous loaues, respecting the feeding of their bodies, not the feeding of their soules: Therefore Christ dehorted them from food corporall to food spirituall: *Labor not* (saith he) *for the meat that perisheth, but for the meat that endureth to everlasting life, which the sonne of man shall giue vnto you, &c.* And thus much touching the occasion, why Christ is saide to bee the true bread of life, Ioh. 6. 27

which as farre excelled Manna, as the ſoule the bodie, life death: eternitie time: and heaven earth.

3 *Point.* NOw let vs ſee according to which of Chriſts natures, he is called our liuing Bread, whether according to his manhood or godhead, or both. Chriſt calls this bread his fleſh, and Chriſt & his fleſh are al one, & therefore Chriſt & his fleſh are all one & the ſame bred; & as our bodies are fed with material bread, ſo are our ſoules fed with the fleſh of Chriſt, & this fleſh hee will giue for the life of the world, which fleſh is not Chriſts bodie ſeparated from his ſoule (as ſome of you imagine and vntruelie teach) nor Chriſts bodie and ſoule ſeparated from his diuinitie, but euen his quickning fleſh; which being perſonally vnited to his eternall ſpirit, was by the ſame given for the life of the world, not corporallie and really in the Sacrament as you vntruly teach: But in the ſacrifice of his bodie and bloud once on the croſſe, as the Scriptures record: for the fleſh of Chriſt profiteth not, but as it is made quickning by the ſpirit. Neither do we participate the life of his ſpirit, but as it is communicated vnto vs by his fleſh, by which we are made fleſh of his fleſh, and bone of his bone: as hath bin ſhewed before. Which holie miſterie is repreſented vnto vs in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and the trueth thereof aſſured and ſealed in the due adminiſtration and receiving of the ſame.

So this true bread (ſpoken of in the ſixt of *Iohn*) which hath this ſpirituall quickning and nouriſhing power, is compleate Chriſt, God & man, with all his ſoule-ſaving merits. And neither Manna in the wilderneſſe: nor your round Wafer-cakes vppon your ſuppoſed hallowed Altars. Manna it could not be, for it ceaſed manie hundred years before. Your imagined and tranſnatured bread it could not bee, be-

cauſe

cause the Sacrament was not then instituted. And so to the third point.

The manner how this true bread (Christ) must be eaten.

THe meat is spirituall, and therefore the manner of eating must not bee corporall; for such as is the meat, such must be the mouth: but the meat is spirituall, therefore the mouth must be spirituall, as before you haue heard, *Fide non dente, &c.* which thing being there handled before out of holy Scriptures, Fathers, and your Popes Canons, I will onelie referre you thither, where you may (vnlesse you bee male-contents) be fully satisfied touching the true manner of eating Christ: where you may find proued out of Gods booke, that comming to Christ, beleeving in Christ, abiding in Christ, dwelling in Christ, and to be clad with Christ, and to eate Christ, are all one, so that out of everie one you might frame this or this like vnaunswerable argument. 3 *Point.* *In the epistle to the Reader.*

Whosoever dwels in Christ and Christ in them, onelie eates Christs flesh and drinkes Christs bloud. But the true beleevers onelie dwell in Christ and Christ in them: therefore the true beleevers onelie eate Christs flesh and drinke Christs bloud. *Ioh. 6. 5. 35.*

The proposition is Christs owne words, of which it were damnable to doubt. The assumption is *Pauls, Let Christ dvvell in your hearts by faith*: therefore the conclusion cannot be denied. And so to the fourth. *Ioh. 6. 56. Ephe. 3. 17.*

The fruit and profit that redoundes to the true eaters of this bread of life, vvhich is Christ.

MAnie rich benefits we haue by eating Christ in the manner aforesaid: that is, by apprehending, applying, and appropriating vnto vs whole Christ with his benefits, I will onelie name one or two, and 4 *Point.*

referre you for the rest to the sixth of *Iohn*. *He that*
Ioh. 6. 44. 54. 50. 51. *eateth this bread, I will raise him vp at the last day to life* (concerning his bodie,) *and hee shall neuer die but liue for euer,* (concerning his soule.)

But an opposition being made betwixt this true bread Christ, and this Sacramentall bread, (as was betwixt Christ and Manna,) it will bee cleere, (nay impossible) that your consecrated bread should bee the bread of life which is spoken of in the sixth of *Iohn*:

1 Your consecrated bread never came from the heauen of heauens: therefore it is not the true bread of life spoken of in this place.

2 All that eat of this true bread (Christ) are saued, but manie that eate of your Sacramentall bread are damned: therefore it is not that bread spoken of in the sixth of *Iohn*.

3 Your bread onelie enters the bodilie mouth, and is received into the stomacke of the bodie, and so passeth the way of all excrements: and therefore is not the true bread.

4 Your bread cannot for ever preserue temporall life, much lesse giue it, but not at all life eternal; and therefore it is not the true bread of life spoken of in this sixth of *Iohn*.

Ioh. 6. 54. 50. Now seeing that Christ had not all this time when he made this sermon in the sixth of *Iohn* ordained his last Supper, and therefore not the bread in the Supper: And seeing this bread can neither assure the bodie of the receiuers of resurrection, nor their soules of saluation, it cannot be that this bread in the Sacrament was the same that Christ spake of in *Iohn*: And therefore your proofes brought to proue your carnall presence of Christ by these texts, be impertinent, sauouring (by your leaue) of smaal reading in the Fathers, and lesse vnderstanding in the Scriptures.

But

But that all men that read this, may see your errours, & so beware of your new daungerous doctrine, I will bring *Augustine* & other Fathers, to disproove you in plaine termes for misalleadging these texts.

Augustine bringeth forth (as it were vpon a stage) the three Evangelists, *Mathew*, *Mark*, and *Luke*, delivering the doctrine of the Sacrament; but whē he came to *Iohn*, he saith: *Iohannes autem de corpore & sanguine Domini hoc in loco nihil dixit*: *Iohn* in the 6. of his gospel spake nothing of the Lords body and bloud. I wōder with what face you can brag to follow the fathers, & no mē nor sect more opposit to their faith & facts then you. There *Aug.* hath cract your credit, salue it how you can. And your own Doctour *Lyra* condemnes your erronious opinion which will applie these as spoken of the Sacrament: his words be these; *Nihil directe pertinet ad Sacramentalem vel corporalem manducationem, hoc verbum: Nisi manducaueritis, &c. Nam hoc verbū fuit dictum diu antequam Sacramentum Eucharistiæ fuerit institutum.* This saying of Christ (*vnlesse you eat the flesh of the sonne of man and drinke his bloud,*) doth nothing directly appertaine to the Sacramentall or corporall eating of Christ in the Sacrament. For Christ spake this long before he ordained this Sacrament. Therefore no sound argument (saith he) can be grounded vpon that litterall exposition of the Sacramentall communion, and he giues a reason vnaunswereable. *Nam primo debet existere in rerum natura.* For first the Sacrament must be ordained, before it can be a Sacrament. But you here would haue Christs carnall presence in the Sacrament before it bee a Sacrament. And then *Lyra* concludes, *De Eucharistia Sacramentali quæ nondum fuit tam alta sententia proferri non potuit, quæ dicitur. Nisi manducaueritis, &c.*

Aug. Tomo quart. de consensu Evangelistarū: lib. 3. Cap. 1. math. 26 mark. 14. Luk. 22. Ioh. 6. These three Evang. handled (as it were) the bodie of Christ, Iohn the soule and diuinitie of Christ.

Lyra in psal. 110.

Therefore of this place, there can bee made no good ſufficient argument, touching the ſacramentall communion, vnleſſe (ſaith he) ſome curious *Heretiques* will take theſe words ſpoken by Chriſt to be ſpoken propheticallie.

Quod nõdum eſt, non datur priuilegiũ. Lyra. eodem loco.

Now ſaieth your owne Doctour, if you take this chapter of the ſixt of *Iohn* litterallie (as you do) then it is impoſſible and abſurd, becauſe you will haue a carnall preſence in the Sacrament, before there be a Sacrament; if propheticallie, then your owne champion calls you curious *Heretiques*. And to prooue your litterall expoſition, groſſe, falſe, and abſurd: he produceth againſt you two famous examples, the firſt of the *Theefe* on the croſſe, who by his liuely faith performed the tenor of this text, yet neuer communicated Sacramentallie; And *Iudas*, who communicated vnder both kinds, and yet failed in the meaning of this precept. And then ſhuts vp the mouths of all *Litteraliſts* and *Heretiques* that hold this ſpoken of the Sacrament, alleadging *Thomas Aquinas* his draught out of *Auguſtine*, *Non manducans manducat, & manducans non manducat.* Hee that eateth not Sacramentally, may yet eate Chriſt ſpiritually by faith, and ſo did the *Theefe* on the croſſe, and was ſaued. Some eate the Sacramentall bread but not Chriſt, (which is the inward grace of the Sacrament:) as *Iudas* did and was damned.

Luk. 23. 43.

Lib. 4 diſt. 9.

manie moe Fathers ſhall you haue to ſecond theſe againſt you if theſe ſatisfie you not.

Thus you are condemned by two learned Fathers, that you ignorantlie, or malitiouſly, or both, miſtake and miſapplie the ſixth of *Iohn*, to ſpeake of the Sacrament before the Sacrament was inſtituted.

Now you ſhall heare *Auguſtine* tell you, that this ſixt of *Iohn* is to be taken figuratiuelie, and allegoricallie, and therefore ſpirituallie, meaning that the ſpeeches and phraſes which Chriſt vſed be borrowed and

tranſlated

translated from the bodie to the mind, from eating and drinking to beleeving, from chamming with the teeth, to the beleeving with the heart. So that what eating and drinking is to the bodie, that beleeving is to the soule. And as bread and flesh be meat corporall for the bodie; so Christ our bread is made spirituall for the soule. And as corporall meats are taken with the corporall mouth, so are spirituall meates (Christ crucified with all his benefits) received with faith, the mouth of the soule. And therefore to teach all posterities how to expound these words of Christ, hee giues a generall rule perpetually to be observed in GODS church: Saying: (a) *Si praeceptiua locutio est, &c.* if the Scriptures seeme to commaund an horrible or vile fact, the speech is figuratiue; and then alleadgeth your second proofe that you bring out of the sixt of *Iohn* for example. *Except you eate the flesh of the Sonne of man and drinke his blond, yee shall haue no life in you. Facinus & flagitium videtur iubere,* Christ (in this place) seemes to commaund a wicked and horrible act. *Figura ergo est,* It is therefore a figuratiue speech, commaunding vs to keepe in mind that his flesh was crucified and tormented for vs. Now examine *Augustines* exposition. To eate corporallie, reallie, and substantiallie Christs flesh with our material mouths, and to drinke his precious, substantiall, reall bloud with our bodilie lips, is a horrible thing: Therefore Christs words bee figuratiue. So that by *Augustines* owne words your litterall sence and carnall presence is wicked and horrible, howsoever you cloake it with fained titles, to blinde the eies & deceaue the hearts of simple Catholiques.

you are not onely taxed by Aug. to bee ignorant in the circumstance of the text, but also in the sence of the text which is a grose thing in diuines.

(a) *De doct. Christ. lib. 3. cap. 16.*

The second proofe out of the sixt of Iohn,

And if you would but read the fifth chapter of the foresaid booke, you should see his Christian caueat he giues to Gods Church touching this point. *In principio cauendum est ne figuratam locutionem ad litteram accipias, &c.*

accipias. &c. First of all, you must beware that you take not a figurative speech according to the letter: his reason followes, *for the letter,* (that is, the litterall sence) *killeth. But the spirit,* (that is, the spirituall sence) *giveth life. For when we take the figurative speech for a proper speech, we make the sence carnall, neither is there any thing more like called the death of the soule.*

Thus you see *Aug.* teacheth (if you would learne) that if the speech be proper, the sence must bee litterall and carnall: but if it be figurative, it must bee misticall and spirituall: and alleadgeth this your own text for the same. So I would wish you either follow *Augustines* doctrine, or else cease to vse *Augustines* and the rest of the fathers names: for in vsurping their names, and perverting their doctrine, you abuse the Fathers, and deceive the Catholiques. Your *Bernard* also in later times condemnes your ablurd & vnchristianlike exposition of this your owne text, *Valesse you eate the flesh of Christ, &c.* He asketh the question. *Quid autem est manducare eius carnem, & bibere sanguinem? nisi communicare passionibus eius, & eam conversationem imitari quam gessit in carne:* What is to eate Christs flesh and drinke his bloud? but to communicate with his passions, and to imirate his holie conversation in the flesh. And then followeth: *Vnde & hoc designat illustrum illud Altaris Sacramentum, vbi Dominicum corpus accipimus: vt sicut videtur illa panis forma in nos intrare: sic noverimus per eam quam in terris habuit conversationem, ipsum intrare in nos, ad habitandum per fidem in cordibus nostris.* Whence also this (text) signifieth that pure Sacrament of the Altar, where we receive the bodie of Christ: that as the forme of bread is seen to enter into vs, so we shall know Christ entreth into vs to dwell in our hearts by faith, by that holie and godlie conversation that he had being in earth.

Ber. Serm 3. in ps: Qui habitat. Fol 68 Col. 2.

Now

Now examine *Bernard* your owne Abbot though living in the palpablest time of the groseſt ſuperſtition: yet he vtterly condemnes your expoſition of this place, and ſheweth you that it doth not ſignifie Chriſts carnall preſence in the Sacrament. But as the Sacrament conſiſteth of an outward ſigne and inward grace: ſo bread the outward ſigne entreth into the mouth, and Chriſt which is the inward grace, entreth into our hearts by faith. So that your owne Author tells you, it is bread that entreth the mouth, it is Chriſt that entereth the heart, and that by faith, not by teeth: by beleeving, not by chamming or ſwallowing. So that this your *Bernard* teacheth you, that this your text muſt be taken for the diuiner part of the Sacrament, which is Chriſt with all his merits, to the ſoules and hearts of the beleevers, not to or in the blaſphemous mouthes, and ſtinking ſtomackes of Jnfidells, wicked men, dogges, cats, or other beaſtes, as your owne bookes moſt wickedly record.

Groſe abſurdities follow the Prieſts expoſitions.

And if your litterall expoſition were true, the none could bee ſaued, but ſuch as eate your conſecrated Chriſt made of bread: then infants that die and communicate not, ſhould be damned. Captiues that from their cradle liue vnder Tyrants & thoſe that before Chriſt in Chriſtes time: and in the firſt thouſand years after Chriſt, before your new conſecration was ſtamped, are damned. And contrariwiſe, all that eate of your conſecrated Oſte be ſaued, bee they neuer ſo blaſphemous to God, traiterous to their Prince, and iniurious to their brethren.

But that both theſe extreames that ſpring from your litterall expoſition contrarie to ſcriptures and fathers be falſe & horrible to chriſtian eares: no godlie man may doubt, vnleſſe he will denie Chriſt and his word: the auncient Fathers, and the Primitiue church, and you ſhall neuer giue the Catholiques that haue

hanged their precious soules vpon your bare sayings, due satisfaction in *this*, without publike and penitent recantation of *this*.

You follow neither Scriptures nor Fathers.

If with the Fathers you would but obserue duelie the circumstances of the fifth and sixth of *Iohn*, you might see, it cannot be meant of the Sacrament, and therefore you are deceived in the Scriptures, because the Sacrament was not then ordained. Againe, by the iudgement of *Augustine* the speech is figuratiue, and therefore the sence spirituall. And so *Augustine* stands with vs against you.

Olde Lyra saith, that the fifth of *Iohn*. *Nihil directe pertinet, &c.* speaketh not one word directlie & pertinentlie of the Sacrament. The Father saith, *nihil*, nothing, *directe* directly, yet you against Scriptures and Fathers will wrest these texts indirectlie, and impertinentlie, to speake of the Sacrament before it was a Sacrament.

If we should commit such palpable errours against Scriptures, Fathers, and common sence, you would call vs common sots without learning or sence, plaine murtherers and soule slayers, from which sin the Lord deliver vs both.

Verse. 51. Now I will aske your conscience this question, how durst you cut off Christs words by the waste? meant you plainly in that? surely no: for if you had recited the whole verse, it had marred your market: you onely set downe the middle of the sentence, concealing the beginning of it, and curtalling the end of it, and so thinking that to serue your turne, and blinde the eies of the simple. But God willing I will discover the trueth, which you seeke to cover, and let the simple people see how farre and how long you haue deceived and misledde them, to the great perill of their soules, with wresting the scriptures, and wronging the Fathers.

Christs

Christs whole sentence was this. *I am the living bread which came downe from heauen, if any man eate of this bread he shall liue for euer:* and this you cut off. Then followes your proofe. *The bread that I will* Iohn. 6. 51
giue is my flesh: then you cut all the rest: *which I will giue for the life of the world.* If you had dealt plainly, and delivered Christs words to Gods people without substraction, as Christ delivered them vnto you, then the people even the simplest of them, would not haue so long beene deceaved by you. For the former part of the verse, and the later concealed by you, expound Christs minde, and bewray your errours.

Let me but reason with you out of the first part of the verse, from the propertie of this bread heere spoken of by Christ. First it is living bread, & giues eternall life to the receivers: yours doth not. This came from heaven, yours did not. Who so eates of this cannot be damned: but manie eat of yours, and die eternally: and therefore the very properties of this bread shew plainely, that it cannot be meant of your singing-cakes, as hath beene prooved before vnto you. Because they haue no life in themselues, and therefore can neither giue life, nor preserue life vnto others. The later part of the verse concerneth Christs flesh, which is this true bread. And thus out of Christs words I prooue that the flesh of CHRIST spoken of in this place, cannot bee the flesh of CHRIST which you would haue given in the Sacrament.

Christs flesh promised in the sixth of *Iohn*, was onely given on the crosse: but the Sacrament was not the crosse. Therfore in the Sacrament the flesh of Christ was not given: So that these arguments grounded vpon Christs owne words, which you conceale, confute you & your carnall presence in the Sacrament.

For your ſacramental bread neither came from heaven, nor your imagined fleſh of Chriſt made by the Prieſt cannot be this fleſh here ſpoken of. For it was offered onee not often as you teach, and that by himſelfe, not by the Prieſts: vpon the croſſe, not in your Maſſe: and that for the plenarie remiſſion of the ſinnes of all beleevers, no for the temporall benefit of ſome perticuler perſons, quick, or dead, as the Prieſt pleaſeth.

Catho. Prieſts. The third proofe of the Catholique Prieſts out of the ſixth of *Iohn*, to prooue Chriſts carnall preſence in the Sacrament. *Verſ* 55. *My fleſh is meate truely and my blood is drinke truelie:*

Reader. IF you ſhould aske your boy in his Grammer rules a queſtion, if he aunſwered not in the ſame caſe, or by the ſame tenſe of a verbe that the queſtion is asked by, you will count him a ſilie *Grammatiſt*. But if you aske your *Sophiſter* a queſtion in *quid*, and hee aunſwere in *quale*, you will taxe him for an improper and impertinent aunſwere. But moſt of all, if a great Divine be asked a queſtion, to prooue the *manner* of a thing; and he neglecting or omitting that, as too hard or impoſſible for him, prooues the *matter* that was never demaunded or doubted of, what will the Reader thinke of this *matter*, this *man*, & this *proofe*? ſurelie he muſt ſay, either hee vnderſtandeth not the ſtate of the queſtion, or elſe he is not able to prooue the queſtion: and ſo vſeth this ſhamefull ſhift, inſtead of a ſufficient proofe.

All the Catholiques in this kingdome expected to be ſatisfied by your aunſwere touching the *manner* of Chriſts preſence in the Sacrament, whether it be carnall or ſpirituall: and whether he muſt be eaten by faith ſpirituallie, or the teeth carnally. And

your

your aunſwere is as improper and impertinent, as either *Grammatiſt* or *Sophiſter*, for you leaue the *maner* of Chriſts preſence which you ſhould prooue, and bring the *matter* of his preſence which was never in queſtion, ſaying; *My flesh is meat truly, &c.*

How this your aunſwere doeth reliſh of learning let the learned judge. When all the Catholiques in the kingdome hang their ſoules on your ſaying? Are theſe your contentments you giue them? If they aske you how they muſt eate Chriſts fleſh & drinke Chriſts bloud, then you tell them: *my flesh is meate in deed, and my blond is drinke in deed.* Doe you aunſwere their queſtion or ſatisfie their conſcience, or reſolue their doubts? alaſſe no. Thus you haue dealt, dallied, and deceiued a long time Chriſts people with theſe your improper, impertinent, vnprofitable, nay vntrue aunſweres, and yet you will be called Fathers, Doctours, and what not.

But I pray you tell me why you added not the next words of Chriſt? you thought they were againſt you. But if you had dealt as men having Gods feare before your eies, you would not haue ſtaied there: for the next verſe plainely diſcovers your bad dealing with the ſimple people, for that aunſwereth their queſtion, & that would ſatisfie all good Catholiques in this point. For if you aske there the holy Ghoſt this queſtion: how muſt Gods children eate Chriſtes fleſh and drinke Chriſts bloud: he will aunſwere you: that whoſoever dwels in Chriſt and Chriſt in him, eates Chriſts fleſh and drinkes Chriſts bloud: but the faithfull onely dwell in Chriſt and Chriſt in them, therefore the faithfull onely eat Chriſts fleſh & drinke Chriſts bloud: whether it be in hearing the word, in baptiſme, or in the Lords Supper, as you haue heard before. If you had added this verſe, it had overthrown your carnall preſence in the Sacrament, & your orall

eating of Christ with your mouth, teeth &c, But in you wrong the Catholiques with an impertinent answere, and as you abuse them by keeping backe the next words of Christ which expounds his owne meaning: So heere you abuse your holie Father the Pope, and your deare mother the Church of Rome, in expounding this text contrarie to the Romane sence; for you take this flesh of Christ which is our true meat, to be the flesh which was borne of the virgin and suffered on the crosse, but the Popes & church of Rome say contrarie: for these be the wordes of the Canon: *Dupliciter intelligitur caro & sanguis Christi, vel spiritualis illa atque divina: de qua ipse ait, Caro mea vere est cibus & sanguis meus vere est potus: nisi meam carnem &c. Vel caro mea ea qua crucifixa est, &c.* The flesh and bloud of Christ (saith your own Church of Rome) must be considered two manner of waies, either for the spirituall and divine flesh spoken of by Christ, *my flesh is meat indeed, &c. and except you drinke his bloud, &c.* or else for that his flesh which was crucified, and that his bloud shed by the sharp launce of a cruell souldiour: so that heere you forsake your Romane Catholique faith, and become Apostates from the Church of Rome. Thus you abuse the Catholiques, in making them beleeue you teach as the Pope teacheth, and you doe not: therefore either the Pope or you must erre grosly, teaching contraries. But that all men may see, that not onely this Pope, but also other Popes haue held the contrarie opinion to your new broched heresie, I will alledge him that you dare not contradict, that is, *Innocentius tertius* that first begat your abortive *Transubstantiation. De spirituali commestione Dominus ait, Nisi manducaveritis, &c.* The Lord Christ when hee spake of the spirituall eating, said: *Except yee eat the flesh of the sonne of man, &c.* Loe, heere is another

Dist. 2. de consec. pag. 434. canon dupliciter, Col. 4.

Read the glosse and you may see your error as in a glasse.

Innocentius tertius: lib 4. cap. 14. de Sacramento Altaris.

Pope

Pope against you. For you late Iesuites, Semynaries, Rhemists, and Priests, take this as spoken of Christs flesh in the sacrament, and they take it for that spirituall and divine flesh of Christ, whereon all the faithfull fed by faith, as well before Christs incarnation, as since his ascention.

I would bring more witnesses against your vnture expositions and allegations, but that I thinke it sufficient that the Parentes Testimonie is the strongest Evidence against their degenerat children. And after, the Pope alleadgeth *Augustine* and the Canon. *Quid paras dentem & ventrem, crede & manducasti*, and then concludes against your carnall eating of Christes flesh most strongly: *Qui credit in Deum, comedit ipsum, Caro Christi nisi spiritualiter comedatur non ad salutem sed ad iudicium manducatur.*

The Pope your Father, and Rome your mother witnesses against you Priestes & the rest of their degenerat children.

Why (saieth your Pope) preparest thou thy teeth to eate and thy bellie to be filled? beleeue & thou hast eaten, hee that beleeues eates. For the flesh of Christ is not eaten to salvation, but to destruction, vnlesse it be eaten spirituallie. And there in the next chapter, the Pope giues this marginall note: *Christus est spiritualis Eucharistia*; Christ is our spiritual Eucha- *Pag.* 180. rist, not our carnall food in the Sacrament. And in the same page he saith, *Cibus est non corporis, sed animæ*: this is not meat for the bodie, but for the soule. And if it bee meate for the soule, then it must bee received by faith, not the mouth, spirituallie not carnallie.

You see now the Scriptures, Fathers, Popes olde and new, the Text and glosse of your deare mother the Church of Rome against you. And least you should cavil, I haue alleadged the Bookes, Chapters, Distinctions and Pages. And if you will still tel the Catholiques that these places by mee alleadged

be not true, then I tell you, all your owne Authors and prints be falſe: for I alleadge Father, Pope, and Canons of your owne print; and if you doubt, looke vnto your owne bookes and prints, and you ſhal find them ſo *verbatim*, vnleſſe your late *Index expurgatorius* hath blotted out the trueth, as in manie things it hath.

Printed Anno. 1599. Impenſis Lazari Zetzneri.

But I will of theſe your former improper and impertinent teſtimonies out of the ſixth of *Iohn* conclude, and vrge no further but this one argument againſt you and them, and then let the indifferent Reader iudge whether you haue not deceiued Gods people by miſvnderſtanding the holie Scriptures or no:

Whoſoever teacheth that there is a carnall reall preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament before conſecration, is a lyer, a depraver of the truth, and a deceiver of the people. But ſome late Popes, the new church of Rome, with the colledge of Cardinals, new created Ieſuits, Semynaries, and all the Romiſh Prieſts now in Ireland teach, that there is a carnall reall preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament before conſecration.

This is vnaunſwerable.

Therefore ſome late Popes the new Church of Rome, with the colledge of Cardinals, new created Ieſuits, Semynaries, and all the Romane Prieſts now in Ireland be lyers, depravers of the trueth, and deceivers of the people. The maior or firſt propoſition is your owne doctrine: for you teach that before *Hoc eſt corpus meum* be pronounced, there is no conſecration. The aſſumption or later propoſition is as cleere, for you perſwade the ſimple people to beleeue that theſe texts out of the ſixth of *Iohn* prooue a carnall preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, a yeare before *Hoc eſt corpus meum* was by Chriſt pronounced, or the Sacrament by Chriſt inſtituted. Therefore the concluſion, that you be lyers and deceivers of the people, is inevitable.

Thus

Thus the Catholiques of this kingdome by the rules of your owne religion you haue deceiued, in teaching Chriſtes carnall preſence in the Sacrament, a yeare before either Sacrament or conſecration in the Sacrament, were inſtituted. And this your leaden diuinitie without care or conſcience you thruſt vppon the ſimple people as ſound doctrine. But if there were no other errour or hereſie held and taught by you, but this one point, it were ſufficient to make all the Catholicks in this kingdome, nay in Chriſtendome, to forſake your opinion, conſidering your ignorance or malice preſuming to iuſtifie that which holie ſcriptures, auncient Fathers, Gods Church, (yea and the perticuler Church of Rome, with their Biſhops, Archbiſhops, & Popes) for a thouſand yeares after Chriſts aſcention never ſpake or heard of, and therefore it is no olde faith taught by them: but a new hereſie inuented by you. But now to the reſt of your proofe.

Math. 26. 26. *Chriſt tooke bread, did bleſſe it, & brake it, and gaue it to his diſciples, and ſaid: take and eate, this is my bodie, This is my blood of the new Teſtament which ſhal bee ſhed for many for remiſſion of ſinnes.* Catho. Prieſts.

GEntlemen: this is your proofe out of Chriſts owne words, & this was deliuered by Chriſts owne mouth at the time of the inſtitution of the Supper, and the night before his bleſſed paſſion, and either this muſt helpe you, or elſe you are helpleſſe: but Chriſt willing I will plainlie ſhew this your proofe to be your reproofe, and I pray God for Chriſt his ſake, that the eies of your vnderſtanding may be opened to ſee the truth, & your hearts touche to receiue and confeſſe the truth: and renounce your errors, and ſo ceaſe to deceiue Gods people and the Queenes ſubiects, leaſt a worſe thing come vnto you. *Ridley.*

All the doubt and controverſie of this queſtion betwixt vs, dependes on this Text which you ſay muſt bee taken properlie and litterallie: wee ſay, Sacramentallie, improperlie, figuratiuelie, and miſticallie. And our opinion (God willing) ſhall be proued by Scriptures, auncient Fathers, and Popes, and the olde Church of Rome.

But this is ſtraunge, that men of your great learning, (as the Catholiques take you to be) wil deale ſo childiſhlie and weaklie in ſo weightie a matter. Bee not offended that I ſay you handle this childiſhlie: for in Schooles he that alleadgeth for the probation of a propoſition, the propoſition it ſelfe: for the probation of a text, the text it ſelfe, is counted childiſh, and it is a childiſh point of Sophiſtrie, and a fallacie to be vſed among young ſchollers, not to be practiſed among ſimple Catholiques.

The Catholiques demand of you how you proone Chriſts carnall preſence in the Sacrament: and you bring in *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, which is the propoſition wherevpon all this diſputation and contention dependeth. After the ſame manner a man may prooue
Ioh.19.27 the bleſſed virgin Marie to be *Iohn* the Euangeliſts mother, and ſay ſtill notwithſtanding any text brought againſt him, as Chriſt ſaid, *Ecce mater tua: Behold thy mother*, ſay what yee will, the words be Chriſts words, therefore they muſt be true, they need no interpretation, Chriſt is not a lyer. And if a man aske a confirmation, and ſay, how prooue you this propoſition of Chriſt to be true litterallie & in deed as Chriſt ſpake it? You bring in for confirmation of the propoſition the propoſition it ſelfe, and ſay *Ecce mater tua: Behold thy mother*. Thus when the Catholiques demaund of you, to prooue your propoſition of *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, whether it muſt be taken corporallie or ſpirituallie, grammaticallie or miſticallie, then you bring

This is a loose kinde of Logique

the

propoſition it ſelfe, and ſay, *Hoc eſt corpus meum* to proue *Hoc eſt corpus meum*: & ſo you would proue *idem per idem*, which is verie childiſh, and a begging of that as graunted which is yet in queſtion betwixt vs and vndetermined: *In Schools it is called Petitio principij.*

But you ſhould haue prooued by other places of Scriptures, that *Hoc eſt corpus meum* changeth the nature and ſubſtance of bread and wine: and you ſhould haue proued by the Scriptures, that the Propheis foreſhewed this ſtrange conception of Chriſt to be conceaued of bread, as well as they did foreſhew his conception of the virgin. *Eſay. 7. 14.* And you ſhould haue prooued by the Scriptures that it is not onelie a Sacrament, but a ſacrifice, not onely Euchariſticall but as well propitiatorie: and not onelie profitable to the quicke, but alſo to the dead: nay, not onelie for plagues among men, but murren and diſeaſes alſo among beaſts. *Cum multis alijs quæ nunc, &c.*

Now ſhew by the Scriptures that *Hoc eſt corpus meum* hath ſuch a ſence, that the ſimple people may repoſe themſelues more ſecurely vpon your opinion and proofes. But till you prooue it (which you can never doe) they muſt know, you haue and doe deceiue them with falſe expoſitions againſt veritie, antiquitie, authoritie, yea & conſent of the old church of Rome.

And heere I am ſorie I muſt tell you ſo plainelie, that you wrong greatly and grievouſly Gods truth, and the Queenes Subiects, in thus miſalleadging this text.

1 Firſt, by Addition of a word.

2 Secondly, by miſvnderſtanding and miſapplication of another word.

3 Thirdly, by omiſſion, nay plaine ſubtraction of a whole verſe.

For the firſt, which is: Addition, you adde this *Addition.*

particle (*it*) which is neither in the Greeke, nor in your Romane Latine Bible, no nor in your Rhemish Testament, nor ever seen in anie Doctor of antiquitie, and this sillable altereth the sence and perverteth Christs meaning, and is added by you to maintaine that which the Text otherwise could not haue anie shew to beare.

Misapplication.

Secondlie, you misvnderstand and misapplie this word (*Blesse*): for we say it signifieth to giue thanks with the mouth, and you say to make crosses with the fingers: wee say it was spoken by Christ to his Father, you say it was spoken to, over, or vpon the bread and challice, and that hee vsed power & active words vpon them: we contrarie will shew out of the word it selfe, that it hath no such signification.

Rhe. Test. 1. Cor. 11. Sect. 9.

One part of the originall word (in Greeke) signifieth in English (*Speech*) vttered with the mouth, not a magicall crossing of, or with fingers. And the other Greeke word which must be iudge betwixt vs, doth signifie to laude, to praise, and to blesse: & blessing, praising, and thanksgiving are all one, as anone you shall heere Christ himselfe so to expound it, and all the Euangelists & *Paul* agree in one congruence touching this matter against you. But first I will shew the simple how diuersly this word (*Blesse*) is vsed in the Scriptures.

How blesse & blessing are vsed in Scriptures

To blesse God is to praise him, and giue him thankes for all his mercies, as you haue in *Luke*: and the disciples continued in the Temple lauding & blessing God: I hope you will not say they crost God with their fingers or consecrated him to make him more holie, but praised him with their mouths. For if you take blessing of God in that fingered sence, then see the absurdities you fall into.

Luk. 24. 53.

Ioh. 1. 18. Ioh. 4. 24.

First, against Scriptures, you must hold that God the Father is not a Spirit, but hath a bodielie share

at

that may bee touched and croſt with our corporall fingers? if this you hold you ioyne with thoſe auncient Hereticks of Egypt, who held that God had a bodie and members as man had. *Anthropomorphita.*

And the ſecond abſurditie (nay blaſphemie) is this, that you ſhould make GOD (who is holineſſe it ſelfe) the holier by your croſſing: but I hope you will not take bleſſing in this ſence, but ioyne with the Diſciples and vs, that bleſſing of GOD ſignifieth praying of GOD, or praying to GOD: for one man to bleſſe another, is nothing elſe but to praye for them, and to beſeech God that he would bleſſe them, that is, defend them, protect them, and be mercifull vnto them: So *Iſaack* bleſſed *Iacob*, and *Iacob* the ſonnes of *Ioſeph*. And ſo the LORD commaunded *Moſes* to ſpeake to *Aaron*, and to his Sonnes, ſaying, *Thus ſhall yee bleſſe the children of Iſrael, and ſay vnto them: The Lord bleſſe the and keepe thee, the Lord make his face to ſhine vpon thee, and be mercifull vnto thee, &c.*

What it is for one man to bleſſe another.
Geneſ. 27.
Geneſ. 48.
Numb. 6. 23.

Let your High-prieſts of Rome, and you low Prieſtes of Ireland, learne of Aaron Gods High-Prieſt, how to bleſſe Gods people: & ſo ceaſe to deceiue them anie more.

A Chriſtian patterne not onelie for Prieſts, but alſo for Paſtours and Parents dailie to practiſe, the one for his flocke, the other for his familie: yet both in the Lord. & from the Lord. Which bleſſings are deriued from Gods mercies, & hang not on the ends of Prieſts fingers. Again, you ſee bleſſing is praying with the mouth, not croſſing with the fingers, as you vainlie and fooliſhlie make your Ghoſtlie children beleeue, that if you croſſe them with your two fingers and a thumbe, they are pardoned for their ſinnes paſt, and preſerved that day from future daungers and euill ſpirits. Which fingered bleſſing of yours is as

powerfull to pardon ſinne, and feare away ſpirits, as three ſups of the Challice is to cure the chinne-cough. This bleſſing was commaunded by God to be practiſed by *Aaron* the High-Prieſt, and the reſt of the Prieſts vpon Gods children, but how far your bleſſing differs from this the ſimpleſt may iudge.

For firſt, God commaunded this bleſſing: the Pope your bleſſings. This was by mouth onely, yours with ſome mumbling wordes and charming croſſes with your fingers. This bleſſing was a praier to deſire God to bleſſe: and you teach, that in your breath & fingers there is a power & a certain working or impreſſion of ſome bleſſing vpon them by meanes of your ſaid mumbling and croſſing. But your Prieſts agree with Gods Prieſts, and your bleſſing with fingers, with Gods Prieſts bleſſings with praier of the heart and mouth, even as well as trueth and falſehood, light and darkneſſe, ſuperſtition and religion, Chriſt & *Belial*. And if the Catholiques will but diligently read this commandement of GOD, given to the High-Prieſt and Prieſts in this place, touching the manner how they ſhould bleſſe Gods people. I am reſolved that few Catholiques in this kingdome hereafter will kneele at your feet, or beg at your hand any finger benediction or croſſing, becauſe it hath no warrant from Gods word, and therefore ten thouſand of them not worth a farthing. You croſſe the cup or Challice with a ſet number of croſſes and geſtures: ſometimes blowing over the Chalice, ſometimes croſſing it, ſometimes hiding it that none muſt ſee it, ſometimes lifting it vp that all muſt ſee it: then ioyning and diſioyning of your thumbe and two fingers, with manie moe ſuch Apiſh toies, childiſh trickes, and charming prankes, which haue neither foundation nor relation to Chriſts actions and inſtitution.

How the Prieſts bleſſe the Sacrament.

But

But we in administring this holy Sacrament, confesse the greatnesse and grievousnesse of our sinnes, that can no otherwise bee pardoned but in Christes bloudie and bitter passion: and wee give thankes to God for Christs blessed obedience to the shamefull death of the cursed crosse, by which he hath satisfied Gods wrath, and wrought our reconciliation in the bloud of the same, and continue this Sacrament as he instituted and commaunded in reverence and remembrance thereof, without addition, alteration, or subtraction. And pray that our vnworthinesse and want of faith hinder not our spirituall vnion & reall presence with Christ, which is offered in the word of institution, and sealed in the right receiving of the Sacrament. This is the force and effect of this word (*Blesse*): the true vse wherof Christ by his practize delivered, the Primitiue Church, Fathers, and we imitate. Now whether your blessing in the Sacrament, and your blessing by crossing the people, or ours come nerrer to Gods word and Christs practize, let the best minded to Gods truth iudge, and then with GODS trueth ioyne. Thus much for your Addition, misvnderstanding, and misapplication. Now to your Omission or Subtraction of a whole verse.

Howv the Preachers of the gospell blesse the bread & the cup.

Omission or Subtraction.

You bring for proofe of your carnall presence, the 26. verse and the 28. verse of the 26. chap. of *math.* But you over-skip the 27. verse betwixt them both, which if you had added, it had expounded Christes meaning of this word (*Blesse*) & overthrown your own crossing, and discovered and discomfited other errors of yours: which are, the receiving of the communion in one kinde, of bread onely: and onelie the Priest must drinke of the cuppe, and not all the communicants, which are contrarie to Christs institution, and the auncient practize of the ancient Popes & church of Rome, as shall be shewed hereafter Christ willing.

You cover two errors in concealing one vvhich is a wicked pollicie.

The

The verse that you omit of purpose is this, *And when he had taken the cup and given thankes, he gaue it to them saying, drinke yee all of this*: Now Christ in this verse expoundeth his owne meaning of blessing in the verse before, shewing what hee meant by blessing, after he tooke the bread by the word of giving of thankes after hee tooke the cuppe: So by Christs own exposition, blessing & giving of thankes are all one, or else Christ did rightlie consecrate the bread by vsing the word blessing, but not the cup by vsing the word of giving of thankes; Nay, if blessing and giving of thankes were not all one, then neither *Luke* nor *Paul* haue rightlie penned Christes institution, nor *Matthew* nor *Marke* of the cuppe because neither *Luke* nor *Paul* ever vsed the word *blesse*, either in taking the bread or cup, but the word of giving of thankes, nor *Matthew* nor *Marke* ever vsed the word *Blesse* in receiuing of the cup.

I pray you read the three Euangelists and *Paul* in Greeke, and you shall see as in a glasse your error, and shall finde *Matthew* and *Marke* expound Christs meaning in your ouerslipt verse, in giving of thankes in taking the cup, what he meant by blessing when he tooke the bread; and read also *Luke* and *Paul* in Greeke, and you shall find that they never vsed the word *Blesse*, as aboue said. So then *Luke* and *Paul* expoundeth *Matthew* and *Marke*: nay, *Matthew* and *Marke* in your concealed verse expound themselues.

Mar. 8. 6, 7 If you will read the eighth of *Marke* in Greeke, you shall finde these two words vsed by Christ before his miracle of seaven loaues & a few fishes, and you shall see there the word of thankesgiving put downe first, when he tooke the bread, and then the word *Blesse* put downe when hee tooke the fishes, & there was as great a miracle wrought in the multiplication of the loaues after his thanksgiving, as of the fishe

Blessing and giuing of thankes are all one.

fishes after his blessing. And *matthew* speaking of this miracle as *Marke* did, did onelie vse the worde of thanksgiving, and not the word to blesse at all. Wherby you may see by Christs practise, that blessing and thanksgiving are all one, and they signifie to pray and praiese with voice, and not to crosse with the fingers. Peruse your owne latten Bible, and you shall see that *benedixit* must be taken in no other sence then *sanctificauit* is. Thus the simple may see how greatly you haue erred in these three points abouesaid.

math. 15. 36.

Benedixit by your latten translation is expounded by sanctificauit. Gen. 2. 3.

And I wonder that maister *Henry Fitzsimon*, a Gentleman so well learned (as the Catholickes account) durst put his hand to these grosse errors (which most faselie I keepe with me) allowing them to bee both Apostolicall and Catholicke, whereas they are most antichristian and hereticall. And me thinks, that all the Priests are greatlie in this to be blamed, that will perswade others to follow them, and they will neither follow Christs trueth, the Apostles writings, the Greeke nor latten text, nor the auncient practise of the Primitiue Church of Rome. But now to the rest of the bodie of the text and controversie.

Wherein first let vs examine whether your two propositions, *this is my bodie*, & *this is my blood of the new Testament, &c.* be proper or figuratiue: litterall, or Sacramentall. For if they be improper, borrowed figuratiue and Sacramentall, they prooue neither your Transubstantiation; nor your carnall reall presence, but even plainly disprooue them. Saint *Augustines* rule before recited, if you would be ruled by it (but neither Scriptures nor Fathers can rule you, but you will over rule them) would presently satisfie you, that these two propositions must be figuratiue: the latter you cõfesse, but the former as yet you wil not. His words again for the Readers good I wil repeat: & they be these: If the scripture seem to cõmand any vile or ill fact, ye speech is

Augustin de doctr. christianae, lib. 3. cap. 16. pag. 22 Parisijs. 1586.

 figuratiue,

figuratiue, as, *Except you eate the flesh of the sonne of man, and drinke his blood, you shall haue no life in you: Facinus vel flagitium videtur iubere,* Christ seemeth to commaund a wicked act, (that is, carnallie and grossly to eate Christs flesh, &c. it is therefore a figuratiue speech, So that *Augustine* thus reasons against you, To eate Christs fleth and drinke Christs blood corporallie, is a hainous thing, therefore Christs wordes be figuratiue: so that if to eate Christes flesh with our mouths, and teare his flesh with our teeth, as also actually drinking of his blood bee hainous and wicked: why doe you so eagerly presse the litterall sence of these your two propositions, against truth, against faith, and the auncient Fathers.

Either confute S. Austin or confesse your error: the first is impossible, the second were commendable.

Read it: it containes but 6. or 7 lines. The margin all note there, condemnes your litterall sence.

Augustine in that short 15. chap. of the same booke immediatly going before, wisheth alwaies the interpretation of these and all other figuratiue speeches to be brought *ad regnum charitatis*, to the *kingdome of charitie*, to haue their true exposition. Now if you expounde this litterallie and properlie, you forsake *Augustines* rule, *charities kingdome*, and the Apostolicall and Catholike exposition. It is but small charitie to devoure the food of a friend, but to eate and devoure corporallie and gutturallie the precious bodie and bloud of our Christ and Saviour, it is no charitie. Nay (saith *Augustine*) it is plaine impietie, and a wicked and a most damnable fact. And so to proone the action lawfull, the *kingdome of charitie* hath ever taken these and the like propositions to bee figuratiue, and the sence to be spirituall. Therefore if you will bee loyall subiects of *charities kingdome*, shewe your subiection to her charitable and Catholicke exposition, otherwise you will stand indited of spirituall and uncharitable rebellion.

Augustine would haue you catholicks, but you will bee Capernaits and Cannibals.

Ambr. lib. 4. de Sa-

Ambrose is of the same opinion with vs against you, saying, *Fac nobis (inquit) oblationem ascriptam rationabilem,*

tionabilem, acceptabilem, quod eſt figura corporis & ſanguinis Domini noſtri Ieſu Chriſti: make vnto vs (ſaith the Prieſt) this oblation, that it may bee allowable, reaſonable, and acceptable, which is a figure of the bodie & bloud of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt. And *Ambroſe* preſentlie after, ſaith, the new Teſtament is confirmed by bloud, in a figure of which bloud, wee receiue the miſticall bloud: By theſe words the Reader may ſee, that *Ambroſe* and the Church in his daies, (a) woke it not for the naturall bodie of Chriſt, but for a figure of his bodie, and therefore ceaſe to bragge hereafter to the ſimple, of *Ambroſe* and *Auguſtine*, for they are not of your opinion.

(a) And in the Canon of the Maſſe, you haue theſe words of *Ambroſe* in that part which begins (*Quam oblationem*) but you deale deceitfully with Gods people: for you leaue out theſe words, *quod eſt figura corporis*, and there daſh in fiue red croſſes, and ſtill teach the people, it is Catholicke doctrine and the old religion, but theſe iuglings with the Fathers muſt be left, or elſe good men that follow thoſe Fathers, will doubt that Gods ſpirit hath left you.

And *Auguſtine* elſewhere ſaith, Chriſt commended and delivered to his diſciples the figure of his body and bloud. And *Origin* ſaith, not the matter of bread but the words recited over it doth profit the worthy receiver, this I ſpeake (ſaith he) of the typicall & figuratiue bodie, which is in deede the Sacramentall bread: Vpon the 15. of *mathew*.

Auguſtine confuting *Adimantus* the Heretick, that held that the bloud in man was the onelie ſoule of man: aunſwered, it was ſo figuratiuely, not otherwiſe: and to prooue it he vſeth this propoſition of Chriſt, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, this is my bodie, ſaying, *Poſſum etiam interpretari illud præceptum in ſigno poſitum eſſe: non enim dubitauit Dominus dicere hoc eſt corpus*

sacramentis. cap. 5.

(a) *Innoc. Papa lib. tertius. cap 12. Fol 148 & there ſhal you ſee the fooliſh and phantaſticall reaſons the Pope giues for thoſe ſaid croſſes.*

Aug. in enarratione Pſal. 3. pag. 7. col. 1. Printed at Paris. anno. 1586

Auguſt. tom. 6 contra Adim. cap. 12.

corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui. I may (saith *Augustine*) expound the precept of Christ figuratiuelie: for the Lord doubted not to say this is my bodie, when he gaue the figure of his bodie. *Augustine* saith *Hoc est corpus meum* is a phrase figuratiue, you say no, but it is litterall. Now let the Catholicks take this *Friendlie Caueat* to heart, for they haue no reason to follow you, that forsake the Fathers: and heere may you see that our exposition is anncient, Catholicke, and Apostolicall, yours new, private, and heretical.

Tertull. lib 4. contra Marcion. pag. 233. line 26.

Tertullian an ancient Father saith, *Acceptum panem & distributum discipulis, &c.* The bread which was taken and given to his disciples Christ made his bodie, by saying, this is my bodie, that is, the figure of my bodie, what could be more spoken of them for vs against you. And *Hierome* calls it a representation of the truth of Christs bodie & bloud, & not the body and bloud. And *Ambrose* seconds his former sayings in these words: *In edendo, &c.* in eating & drinking the bread & wine, we doe signifie the flesh & bloud which was offered for vs: so that they doe but signifie the flesh and bloud, they are not the flesh and bloud. And *Chrisostome* saith, *Offerimus quidem sed ad recordationem:* and afterwards, *Hoc autem sacrificium exemplar est illius, &c.* We offer in deed but in remembrance of his death, this sacrifice is a token or figure of that sacrifice, the thing that we do is done in remembrance of the thing that was done by Christ before, &c. Here is a manifest place against you, which you shall never answere. And elsewhere he saith, in the same sanctified vessels there is not the bodie of Christ in deed, but a mistetie of the bodie is contained.

Hierome super 26. matth.

Ambrose in 1. Cor. 11.

Chrisost. in hom. 17. in Hebr. & super. 1. Cor. 11.

Chrisost. in hom. 11. matth.

Clemens Alex. in pædago.

And *Clemens Alexandrinus* who lived 1300. yeares agoe saith, *Comedite carnes meas & bibite sanguinem meum, &c.* Eat ye my flesh and drinke my bloud, meaning

horribly

hereby vnder an allegorie or figure, the meat & drinke that is of faith and promise. And the same reverend Father in his second booke and second chapter of his *Padagogi*, and 51. pag, and line 21, 22, 23. hath these words: *Ipse quoque vino vsus est, nam ipse quoque homo, & vinum benedixit, cum dixit accipite, bibite, hoc est sanguis meus, sanguis vitis, &c.* For our Lord Christ vsed wine, & blessed wine, when he said, take drinke, *this my bloud*, the bloud of the vine. (the word) *which is shed for manie for the remission of sinnes*, doth signifie allegoricallie the holy river of gladnesse.

lib. 1. cap. 6 pag 18. line vlt: & pag 19. lone 1.

Out of fwhich I note: First, it is *sanguis vitis*, the bloud of the grape properlie, and that is wine. It is called Christs bloud Sacramentallie, and by way of signification. Secondlie, it appeares to be figuratiue in this word (*shed*) for the bloud of the grape (which is wine) was not shed for manie, but the bloud of Christ. But you will saye it is true, before consecration, but after consecration it is Christs verie naturall bloud No saith *Clement* immediatlie following, *Quod autem vinum esset quod benedictum est &c.* And that it was wine which was blessed, hee sheweth againe, when he saith to his disciples, *I will not drinke of the fruit of the vine, &c.* Out of which premisses I note three things: First that that which you call consecration, this learned Father calls it benediction. Secondlie, that after consecration the nature of wine remaineth still, and it is not changed as you imagine. Thirdly, that the phrase is figuratiue and not proper. And venerable *Beda* one countrieman tells you, that in England in his time, the text was taken figuratiuely. The solemnities of the old Passover (saith he) being ended, Christ commeth to the newe, which the Church is desirous to continue in tememberance of her redemption, that in stead of the flesh and bloud of a LAMBE, Lee substituting the Sacrament of his

Read Clement. follow Clem.

Beda in luc. 22. page. 476

his flesh and bloud in the figure of bread and wine, might shew himselfe to bee the same to whom the Lord sware and will not repent, &c. *Beda* calleth it not the naturall bodie of Christ that worketh our redemption, but a remembrance of our redemption & a figure of it.

Thus the indifferent Reader may see that *Augustine, Ambrose, Origin. Tertullian, Hierome, & Clemens Alexandrinus, Beda,* and manie others, which I omit for brevities sake, all of them being auncient approoved writers, and all of them of your owne Prints, doe hold with vs against you, that your propositions be not proper but Sacramentall, improper, significatiue, representatiue, allegorically, & figuratiue, which greatlie wounds the bodie of your cause, and will weaken your credits with the Catholickes.

But you will say these testimonies of these Fathers, though of your owne Prints, yet they prooue nothing against you, vnlesse the Church of Rome should receiue and allow that exposition of the fathers to be Catholicke. If you should so replie, surely it were a weake replication and subiect to manie exceptions, and you would wring (I cannot say wrong) the church of Rome, that she should hold a doctrine against all the old Doctors. But if you will thus replie to bleare the eies of the simple, yet will I frustrate your expectation: for now I will shew you that the auncient Popes, and the auncient Church of Rome held as these Fathers did: that the proposition (*Hoc est corpus meum*) to be significatiue and improper, and therefore figuratiue against your opinion. You shall heare the Church of Rome deliver her owne minde with her owne mouth, which you cannot denie, her wordes be these: *Ipsa immolatio carnis quæ sacerdotis manibus consecrati so, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio dicitur, non rei veritate causa: sed significante misterio.* That offering of the flesh

Dist. 2. de consecrati

which

which is done by the hand of the Priest, is called the passion, death, and crucifying of Christ, but not in exactnesse of truth, but in misterie of that which was signified: and the glosse there maketh most plaine against you: *Dicitur corpus Christi sed improprie vt sit sensus, vocatur corpus Christi id est significat corpus Christi*: It is called the bodie of Christ but improperly (that is figuratiuely) that this be the sence: it is called the bodie of Christ, that is, it signifieth the bodie of Christ.

Hoc est pag. 434. You cannot denie but this Pope was a Protestant. And of this cannot be Catholicke, then is your carnall presence antichristian.

I will alleadge in this case other Popes, and the faith of the Church of Rome in another age, whereby the Reader may plainelie see, that the auncient Popes and auncient Rome had the true succession in doctrine which we stand now on, not that false succession of the place, and arotten worme-eaten chaire that you brag of: the glosse speaketh thus against your litterall sence of *Hoc est corpus meum: Hoc tamen est impossibile, quod panis sit corpus Christi*: yet this is impossible that bread should be the body of Christ.

De consecratione dist. 2. Panis est in altare, Glossa ibid. page. 435. Not possible by their owne confession that bread should bee the bodie of Christ?

Now gentle Reader see the wrong the late Popes and Priests offer to the Catholicks of this kingdome: they would haue them imbrace that for faith, which the old Church of Rome held for heresie: that for possibilitie, which she saith is impossible. Why, would you haue vs to beleeue that which you your selues say is impossible. This, all the Iesuits and Priests in Christendome cannot aunswere.

If you say these two Popes and the Church of Rome then taught the truth, why doe you now dissent from the olde Romane faith? If you saye the Popes and Church of Rome then erred, you will be counted an hereneke: and therefore in Gods feare confesse the trueth with vs and the olde Church of Rome, and deceiue the Catholickes of this kingdome no more, with this litterall sence of *Hoc est corpus meum*,

dist. 2. can: Corpus Christi. pag. 438. col. 4.

You cannot denie this Pope to be a protestant in this point.

The Popes glosse against the Popes text

And Gelasius another Pope more auncient then these against Eutis of this opinion.

dicem, which you borrow from the late Popes and late Church of Rome, and is a new error dissenting from the old Catholicke faith.

And I will adde one other Popes Canon, *Corpus Christi quod sumitur de Altari, figura est, dum panis & vinum videntur extra: veritas autem dum corpus & sanguis Christi in veritate interius creditur.* The bodie of Christ which is taken from the Altar, is a figure so long as the bread and wine are seene vnreceived, but the trueth (of the figure) is seene when the bodie and bloud are received truslie, inwardly and by faith into the heart.

Now the glosse in that place expondeth the text and saith, *Corpus Christi est sacrificium corporis Christi, alias falsum est quod dicit*, the bodie of Christ in the text signifieth the sacrifice of the bodie of Christ, otherwise it is false.

Out of which I note, that the Church of Rome calls the outward Elements Christs bodie, that is, a figure of his bodie, being not received though consecrated.

Secondly, that the bodie of Christ, whereof the Sacrament must be a figure, must be received by faith into the soule, nor by the mouth into the stomacke: Now the glosse saieth, the text is false, vnlesse, &c. But I leaue the iarre to be reconciled by you, who be the Popes friends, yet this I say, *Maledicta glossa quæ corrumpit textum.*

These three Popes and the Church of Rome in those daies (it was before the birth of your Transubstantiation and your carnall presence) jumpt with all the old Fathers, and the Primitiue Church that lived the first sixe hundred yeares after Christ, and say it is called the bodie of Christ, the flesh of Christ, the passion and death of Christ, but not *rei veritate*, not in deed and trueth, but mistically, significatiuelie, improperly,

properlie, figuratiuelie and by way of representation, and that it is impossible otherwise to bee the bodie of Christ.

Yet when we speake of figures in the Sacrament you mocke vs. When we say the phrase is figuratiue, therefore the sence must be spirituall, you deride vs, as misinterpreters of Scriptures and Fathers. But if your leisure and learning would affoord you but fauour to read with a holie deuotion, the canonicall Scriptures, & the ancient doctors of Christs Primitiue Church, that left vs these lessons for our learning, you should see that wee learne what they taught, and doe what they said, & you follow not what they commaunded, because you know not what they haue recorded.

Now briefly I will acquaint the Reader onely with the times when these Doctors liued, and the places where they taught this doctrine, and then wee shall see whether this your litterall exposition of *Hoc est corpus meum* be Catholicke or not.

Clemens Alexandrinus was diuinitie Reader in the famous cittie of *Alexandria* in *Egypt*, In the yeare of our Lord, 170

Origen was his scholler, and succeeded Lecturer in the same place. 204

Tertullian Diuinitie Reader in *Carthage*, in *Affrick*, 206

Ambrose Bishop of *Millaine* in *Italie*. 370

Hierome Diuinitie Reader in *Stridona* in *Hungaria*; and sometime in *Slauonia*. 387

Chrisostome Bishop of *Constantinople* in *Gracia*. 406

Augustine Bishop of *Hippo* in *Affricke*. 426

Venerable Beda a famous learned man in *Eng-* 570

If you will read aduisedly these fathers, you shal see plainlie your owne errors.

And,

And thus you may see, that neither *Alexandria*, *Carthage*, *Milane*, *Strydona*, *Constantinople*, *Hippo*, nay Rome which are famous Cities, Nay, which is more, neither *Egypt*, *Italie*, *Hungaria* and *Slavonia*, nor *England*, which are famous kingdomes. Nay which is most of all, the three parts of the world, *Asia*, *Affricke*, & *Europe*, never heard or had such a litterall exposition of *Hoc est corpus meum*, for at least eight hundred years after Christ, and yet your Iesuits and priestes will haue their doctrine to be Catholicke, which cannot be, vnlesse it were at all times, and in all places, and of all persons receiued; for so your *Vincentius* defineth Catholicke doctrine. And heere you see that for the three parts of the world, and for many hundred yeares after Christ it was not knowne. And therefore it is neither Apostolicall nor Catholicke.

Vincentius aduersus Hereticos. That is, truly and Catholicke faith he, Quod semper vbique & ab omnibus est creditum. Quæstio. 4. de existentia corporis Christi in Eucharistia. pag. 154. So that your religion is none of Christs, because it is not warranted by the gospell of Christ,

And a late Frier and friend of yours, olde Father *Iosephus Angles* bangs in Cardinall *Caietans* opinion writing vppon saint *Thomas Aquinas* in this manner, *Per Euangelium non possunt catholici hereticos convincere ad intelligenda verba hæc (hoc est corpus meum) proprie: sed tenendum hoc esse solum ex authoritate ecclesiæ, qua ita verba consecrationis declarat.* That is, the Catholickes cannot convince or inforce the Heretickes by the Gospell to vnderstand these wordes, (*hoc est corpus meum, this is my bodie*) properlie, but this exposition must bee fetched and held from the authoritie of the Church, which so expounded the words of consecration. See I pray you, what one of your learnedst Friers reports out of one of your skarlet Cardinals of Rome: that you cannot prooue by Christs Gospell these words, (*this is my bodie*) to haue a proper & litterall signification. So that CHRIST Gospell condemnes your litterall and proper exposition: and so your carnall pretence of Christ must be maintained from and by the authoritie of the church of Rome.

Rome though Christ and his Gospell say no.

Alasse, with what conscience dare you teach the Catholicks this heresie, which by your owne confession hath no warrant from Christs Gospell? And Cardinall *Caietane* himselfe writing vpon your saint *Thomas Aquinas* speaketh to the same purpose, that the Scriptures speake nothing (*expresse*) expressly of Christ his carnall presence in the Sacrament, but onely in these words (*hoc est corpus meum*) which words (saith he) are two waies expounded: first, properlie: secondlie, metaphoricallie. But (saith hee) the maister of the sentences is to be taxed, who held too much with the figuratiue interpretation. And there you shall see that he blusheth not say, that your litterall sence, is not frō the Gospell, but from the church of Rome. *Super quæst. 75. Artic. primo. Fol. 236. Printed at Venice. 1593.* *Lib. 4. dist. 10.*

And if your Romane Church may be both partie, witnesse, and iudge, there is no doubt but th verdict must sound on your side. And there the Cardinall handles *Duas novitates valde mirabiles*, which being dulie examined *parturiunt montes, &c.* with manie other forgeries and fooleries to maintaine your carnal kingdome of your *Breaden-god*. Thus much concerning your two confectratorie propositions, which by the testimonie of *Scriptures* and *Fathers* be figuratiue to be expounded as we say, not properlie & litterallie as you vntrulie teach. But yet you perchaunce will demaund the reason why Christ called it his bodie, if it be not his body: Let me first aske you another question, & then I wil resolue you this: Why did God cal circumcision the covenant, when in deed it was not the covenāt, but (as god himself saith) a signe of the covenāt. Why did God cal the Paschall Lambe the Passover, whē it was but a signe of the Angels passing over the houses where the bloud of the lambe was sprinkled? one answere wil resolue both our questions. It is the vsuall maner of the holy Ghost in all Sacraments both *Gen. 17. 10. 11. Rom. 4. 11. Exod. 12. 11.*

of the old Testament and new, to terme the visible signe by the name of the thing signified, as circumcision is caued the couenaunt, the Lambe is called the Passouer, so Baptisme is called the fountaine of regeneration, and bread Christs bodie, and yet in deed they are but outward signes, and to the faithfull onely seales graced by the holie Ghost, with the names of the things they represent and confirme, the more to mooue and stirre vp our affections, and to edge our zeale with a religious preparation to receiue the same, and to lift vp our hearts and soules by faith, to behold, consider, and feed vpon (Christ crucified) the thing signified. Yet for your further satisfaction, I will intreat *Augustine* to aunswere your doubt, who saith: (a) *Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent, ex hac autem similitudine plerunque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi, corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est:* In English thus, If the Sacrament had not some certaine similitude and likeneſse of the things whereof they be Sacraments, they should be no Sacraments at all. And of this similitude manie times they haue the names of those things themselues, as the Sacrament of the bodie of Christ is after a certaine manner the bodie of Christ, and the sacrament of his bloud is after a certaine maner his bloud, So the Sacrament of faith (or Baptisme) is faith. Out of which wee may note: first, they are but Sacraments, or similitudes of the thing signified not the things themselues: secondlie, that bread & wine are the bodie & bloud of Christ but *secundum quendam modum*, after a certaine maner and thewe, how by an example, as the Sacrament of faith is faith, so the Sacrament of Christs body is

Christs

Wheresoeuer the holie Ghost speaketh of Sacraments the phrase is propeall, metonymicall and figurative, attributing the name of the thing signified to the signe signifying, as in these examples. the phrase addeth a dignitie to the sacrament, but changeth not the nature of the sacrament

(a) *Aug. epistol. 23. ad bonifacium*

Christs bodie, but the Sacrament of faith is not faith naturallie, substantiallie by a chaunge of substance, but by chaunge of qualitie or vse, therefore the Sacrament of Christs bodie is not chaunged into the substance of Christs bodie, but onely in qualitie and vse, as *Theodoret* saith in his first dialogue: not chaunging nature, but adding grace vnto nature. And the same Father in his second dialogue explaines this more plainly, saying, the mysticall signes after sanctification, *Non recedunt a sua natura manent enim in priore substantia & figura &c.* they depart not from their nature, but remaine in their former substance, and figure, & may be seene & touched as before: Out of which auncient learned Father I obserue these necessarie points for the Catholickes instruction, and your confutation: First he saith, *Post sanctificationem*, after sanctification, then your new coined terme of consecration was not known in the Church of God, but sanctification and benediction. Secondly, I note out of this father, that though the Sacraments haue gotten a new diuine qualitie, yet they haue not lost their nature they had before, as you vntrulie teach. Thirdlie, I obserue that he confuted by the example of bread and wine in the Sacrament, certaine Hereticks who held that Christs bodie was chaunged into his deitie after his ascention: for this is the Fathers proofe against those hereticks. That as bread and wine are trulie bread and wine after sanctification, as they were before sanctification, euen so is Christs bodie as trulie a bodie now after his ascention, as it was before his ascention. So now the Priests of new Rome cannot say that the bread and wine haue lost their true natures and properties in the Lords supper after sanctification, vnlesse then will also say with the Hereticks, that Christ hath lost the nature of a true bodie now after his ascention. And *Chrisostome* seconds

Theodoret dialog 2. cap. 4. pag 113. & dialog. 1. cap. 8. pag. 54. read them I pray you.

Consecration vnknown to Theodor. therefore it is a new terme.

The change is in the name honour and vse, not in the nature.

Esther answere this fully. or confesse the truth.

conds *Theodoret* saying *Ante Sanctificationem, &c.* Be-
fore it be sanctified we cal it bread but the deuine grace
once sanctifying it by the ministrie of the Priest it is
deliuered from the name of bread, and counted wor-
thy to be called the Lords body, though the nature of
bread continue there still. Out of which I note first
the father calles it sanctification, not consecration. Se-
condly it is called bred before sanctification & is bread
in nature after sanctification. And thirdly after sanctifi-
catiō it is called the Lords body yet it is not the Lords
body in deede because the nature of bread remaines.
And therefore in that it is calld the Lords body, it must
be so Sacramentally figuratiuely & improperly. And
Gelasius your owne Pope whom you dare not contra-
dict saith plainely *Non desinit esse substantia panis vel
natura vini.* There seaceth not to be the substance of
bread and the nature of wine. But you here will ob-
trude your ouide slanderous obiection, that we accept
of the Sacraments no better then bare figures. No, we
acknowledge a change and an alteration, but not of
the substance but of the vse. Is not this a maruelous
change wrought by the holy Ghost in the due admini-
stration of the Lords supper according to Christ Insti-
tution that of commen bread and wine such as daily we
feede our bodies with, is made the dreadefull and reue-
rend misteries of Christ crucified: where by we neither
looke vppon the bare naked elements as common
creatures, but as sanctified food: And in such sort that
even as the bread doth nourish our bodies, and the
wine doth comfort our spirits: so trulie, reallie, and
vnfainedlie doth the heavenlie food of his bodie cru-
cified, and his bloud shed for our sinnes, by faith in
the time of the holie Supper, feede and nourish
our soules into everlasting life: and so is made and
sealed our reall coniunction with Christ, not by his bo-
dilie and locall discention into our stomackes, but by
our

Iost. ad Cæsarium Monach.

Mark this well yet Preists & Iesuets

What can you saie to these pregnante proofes to satisfie the doubtfull catholiques.

spirituall ascention to him by faith. This is our
doctrine touching these figuratiue propositions, war-
ranted by Scriptures, and witnessed by the auncientest
fathers. Hitherto hath beene plainly and directlie
proued, that your two propositions bee figuratiue,
not proper. Secondlie, that the substances of bread
and wine remain after cõsecration, & therfore there can
be no such carnall presence of Christ by Transubstan-
tiation vnder the formes of bread and wine as
you deeme. Now I am come to your two maine pil-
lers that support & vnderprop your carnall presence,
which if they faile you, then your foundation is san-
die, & your building will not be able to abide the least
blast of Christs breath. The first is *consecration*: the
second *transubstantiation*: for vnles there be consecra-
tion, there can be no transubstantiation, & then no car-
nall presence of Christ in the Sacrament. And then neis
ther your masse nor mattes worth two pence. And so the
soules then in your imagined purgatorie may crie, and
howl for lacke of a dirge and a masse of *Requiem*. But
first I must tell you, the word is new, neither vsed by
Christ or his Apostles in the institution of the sacrament,
nor heard of in any ancient father, for manie hundred
yeares after Christ. Again, you never read in anie au-
thor, sacred or prophane, that consecration should sig-
nifie to change one substance into another, for the na-
ture of the word wil not beare it. Now seeing by Christ
nor his Apostle *Paul*, it was not vsed, nor ancient father
euer tooke it in this sence. Again, the nature of the word
hath no such signification: I see not but you deserue
much blame in binding the Catholickes consciences to
beleeue that which is against divinitie, antiquitie, and
common sence. Now Gentlemen pardon me, to demand
of you but this question, what words be they that cõse-
crate? that is: which turn the substances of bread & wine
into the naturall & substantial bodie & bloud of Christ.

Clem. Alex: Theod: August. with many moe never heard of consecration but of santificati on & Benediction.

Mee

Me thinkes I heare you Iesuits and Priests calling me a foole for demaunding such a question, considering (as yee pretend) that the Church of Rome & her learned men haue euer from Christs time held with one consent one manner of consecration, with a certaine set number of words without addition or alteration, and therefore my question is frivolous & needlesse: and no doubt you make your Catholickes beleeue so, but alasse you deceiue them, it is not so; for I will shew you manie several opinions amongst your learned men, yea Popes themselues one contrarie to another. I praye you let me and the Catholickes of this kingdome therefore be certified and satisfied by Gods word, & the practise of the Primitiue Church for the first six hundred years, which be the words of consecration that worketh this miraculous alteration of substances, which if you cannot proue (as I am sure you cannot) then the Catholickes haue good cause to looke to their consciences, & to follow you no further then you follow Christ according to his word. For if anie man, nay all men, nay if an Angell, nay all Angels, should come from heauen and preach otherwise then Christ and his Apostles haue taught, let him be accursed. If Angels, nay all Angels from heauen, must not be beleeued bringing contrarie doctrine to Christ and his Apostles, will you then binde the Catholickes of this kingdome to beleeue you, onely comming from Rome & Rhemes, whence you bring new doctrine not onelie contrarie to Gods truth, but to the Fathers of the Primitiue Church. And to beginne with *Guido* in his *Manipulo curatorum*.

Such fathers as liued next to Christs time, should know best the practise of the primitiue church, & these fathers you refuse, and chose others a thousand years yonger, and therefore they be of lesse credit Gal. 1. 9.

Guido cap. 4 pag. 23. 24. 25. But more you may see in the

Who saith there be foure several opinions amongst the learned Rabbins of Rome, touching the words of consecration.

The first sort (saieth he) will haue besides the

words

words of the. 3. Euangelists and Paule, the intention of the Priest (a and so saith your masse booke) & the precepts of the Church to bee dulie observed, jumping with your said Masse-booke: that vnlesse the Priests intention bee to consecrate, there is no consecration, though he vse all Christs words, and *Pauls*. And if the priest omit *praecepta ecclesiae*, that is, the commaundements of the Church of Rome in his consecration, *mortalissime peccaret*, he sinnes most deadlie, and is to be punished most grievously. But Abbot *panormitanus de celebratione missarum*, page. 220. is of another minde saying, *Etiamsi sacerdos celebret vt Deus perdat aliquem, tamen bene consecrat*. Notwithstanding the priest saie Masse with intention that God would destroy some man, yet doth hee consecrate well. What Christian heart doth not loath this divelish intention, and hellish religion.

cautels or sleights of your masse concerning the necessitie of the crosses, vvords of the canon of the masse, and the priests intention.

(a) *In he cautels prin. at Venice, 1464.*

Heere let all Catholickes marke, that this first opinion holds that Christes institution is not sufficient without the priests intention. (For if his head be otherwise occupied, he consecrates not) and the due observation of the precepts of the Church, which partlie consist in wordes, partlie in gestures, &c. so that by this opinion, those that simplie and plainlie (for the first eight hundred or a thousand yeares next after Christ) vsed the forme of Christs institution onelie, never consecrated righelie: no not Christ himselfe, nor *Paul*, and so till of late daies there was no consecration, Transubstantiation, or carnall presence.

As the people are not sure of the priests intention, so they are not sure of Christs carnal presence. & so commit idolatrie in worshipping bread being not consecrated.

So that this opinion prooueth your owne transubstantiation & carnall presence, not to be either Apostolicall or Catholicke, but new, invented, and phantasticall. The second opinion is of maister Doctor *Subtilis* (for so he calls him) & he flatlie contradicteth the former opinion, & saith, that all the words from *qui pridie* to *Simile*

If you say Christs institution vvere sufficient, then your canon of your masse is superfluous: if you say it is not sufficient, without your masse canon then Christs institution vvere imperfect. Which to thinke is blasphemy.

to *Simili modo* in the Canon of your masse booke are necessarilie required to consecration, and therefore the former Doctors shot short. But Gentlemen, you know that the Canon of the masse was not made by one Pope, nor by tenne Popes, but in manie hundred years it was in patching togither, I hope you will not saie that those Saints and Martirs of God from Christes time, to the making of that Idolatrous Canon of the masse, beeing manie hundred yeares, had not the right consecration, when they practiz d Christs institution.

Alij dixerunt, there is a third opinion of divers Doctors which held contrarie to both the former, but because it is but fabulous and not woorth reading, therefore I will scilence it, as not worth the writing.

But *Guido* his opinion is flat contrarie to them all, and saith *precisely*, that *hoc est enim corpus meum* doth consecrate without anie more helpe. So *Guido* is contrarie in opinion to the former three opinions, and everie of them all contrarie one to another. Heere now the Catholickes may see the consent and vnitie of the late Church of Rome touching consecration: Yet I will bring you a learned Frier which hath tossed this question like a tennisball. This Frier saith in his conclusion: *Christus Iesus his verbis, hoc est enim corpus meum Eucharistiam confecit, &c.* Christ Iesus in these words for *this is my bodie*, did consecrate the Eucharistie, and so hath continued still by the custome of the Church, &c. But presenthe in his *Appendix* hee checkes that opinion & saith, yet it is to be beleeued, that Christ consecrated with other words then these that he vsed in the institution, and there be manie of this latter opinion saith he, as *Innocentius, &c.* so that it is a palpable discord amongst them touching the verie words of consecration.

Iosephus Angles in lib. 4. sententiarũ. Printed by king Philips priviledge. 1573. pag 108. & 109. de essentialibus Euch.

And

And in the same page he delivereth two other opinions, one of *Thomas Aquinas*, the other of *Scotus*, the one contrarie to the other, which (if you want the booke) I will shew you.

Two other contrarie opinions.

And in the same page he sheweth, that *hoc est enim corpus meum* be the words of Christ, & that *Qui pridie* be the words of the Priest, so that Christs words without the Priests words worke nothing, or are nothing worth. And the same Frier delivers the opinion of Doctour *Soto* touching the intention of the Priest in consecration of the cup, but checks his Doctorship in his immediat conclusion verie sharplie (I will not say shamefullie) saying, *Magister Soto hoc in loco sibi repugnat*: Maister *Soto* in this place disagreeth with himselfe: and olde *Cato* tells vs that he that disagreeth with himselfe, cannot agree with anie.

pag. 109. Soto saith, if Qui pridie being the Priests words, be not vsed as well as Christs, Tunc incertum est, &c. Then it is uncertain whether there be anie Transubstantiation at all. What vvise catholicks vvill beleeue this your uncertaine doctrine.

(a) But in the next pages he setteth down six severall opinions touching the forme of consecration, one contrarie to another, and all of them held and maintained verie stiffie for the truth, whereof fiue of them must needs be false. But I assure you there is none of them of Christs institution, and therefore neither true Apostolicall nor Catholicke. If they were not fabulous and frivolous, I would pen them down *verbatim*. But if you list to see their errors, I haue truelie quoted their places, you may see them without paine, and I trust you will not read them without dislike.

Now let me intreate you to heare some other of your friends speake, that lived in another age, that the Catholickes may see your vncertaintie in this point, that none of you all knowe what to say, nor what to beleeue, and the reason is, because you haue denied and refused the cleere waters of Gods truth, & therefore drinke of the puddels of mens inventions, which are nothing else but fables and lies, without certaintie or veritie.

(a) pag. 113 Read the place.

Gabriel Biel. lect: 36.

Gabriel a learned man on your side saith, *Christus potuit sine verbo tantum verba Dei substantiam panis & vini consecrare, vel potuit verba quadam secreta proferre, & per illa consecrare; vel per hæc verba, hoc est corpus meum, consecrare potuit, vel potuit prius consecrare, & postea distribuere: vel primum distribuere, & postea consecrare: Quid autem horum fecerit ex sacris scripturis non constat:* Christ as being verie God, might consecrate the bread and wine without anie word: Or else he might speake certaine words in secret, and by them consecrates or else might consecrate by these words, *This is my bodie*: or he might first consecrat, and after deliver: or else first deliver, and then consecrate: but which of all these he did, by the holie scriptures is appeareth not. But *Petrus de Alliaco* crosseth them all and saith, that Christ consecrated before these words of *hoc est corpus meum*, for (saith hee) *Quia nisi antea fuisset corpus Christi, Christus non vera dixisset hoc est corpus meum.* If it had not been Christs bodie before Christ could not have said truelie *this is my bodie*. This now toucheth your free-hold, for hee saith plainlie vnlesse consecration goe before these words, *this is my bodie*, both Christ and priest should lie. This trample your consecration in the durt.

Mark this you Priests & Iesuits.

Petrus de Alliaco: in 4. lib. sent. Q. 9.

Behould I pray yee the vncertainty of your consecration & therefore ceasse to defend.

Marke this good Reader. How blasphemous this is, let the learned in christ Iudge.

And your *Antidicagnus* printed at *Colen*, with the approbation of all the learned Doctors in that age saith precislie, that the base words of Christs Institution on without the words of the Canon of the Masse are not sufficient to worke consecration. And *Bonaventura* is not ashamed to say, that if wee will rightlie consecrate, wee must not seeke to the Gospell of Christ, but to the Canon of the Masse. Now *Scotus* (though he be maister Doctour *Sabelis*) is put to his dumpes what to do, in this doubtfull case of consecration, when there be twentie severall opinions one contrarie to another, and all contrarie to Christs truth, by

Bonaventura, in lib. Sentiarum dist. 8. q. 2.

end this is his resolution. *Quod ergo est consilium? dico quod sacerdos intendens facere quod facit ecclesia, legens distincte verba canonis a principio usque ad finem, vere conficit nec est ausum alicui reputare se valde peritum in scientia sua, & dicere velo vti precise istis verbis pro consecratione.* The matter being so doubtfull, what then is your advise? I say, that the priest intending to doe whatsoever the Church doth, and reading the words of the Canon distinctlie and plainly from the beginning to the end, doth verelie consecrate: neither is it wisedome for a man to account himselfe verie skilfull in his knowledge, and to say I will vse (without all doubt) these, or these words to worke consecration. Here your champion *Scotus* cares not a point for your three Evangelists, nor the Apostle *Paul*: for reading of the Canon distinctly is sufficient: Oh damnable heresie, that renounceth Christs institution, and followeth mans invention. And the wordes of your Masse-booke are *distincte, secrete, & attente.* And also it must be pronounced *uno spiritu, nulla pausatione interposita.* If the foresaid cautions be not performed by the priest, your consecration and application is marred, and not worth a pin. Now Gentlemen these be your Doctors, & this is your doctrine: here be twentie severall opinions of consecration in severall ages, and none tells the trueth. Haue you vsed Gods people and the Queenes subiects Christianlie, in perswading them that all Churches, and all fathers, in all ages, with one consent, haue embraced this your opinion touching consecration, for Catholicke without discord or discention? I tell you no, for in this you haue crackt their conscience, & do hazard their soules to maintaine your superstition. But perchance you will perswade the Catholickes, that though these Doctors grossly erred, yet the Church of Rome ever held one manner of consecration, but that is as untrue as the rest. For I will shew

False witnesses examined a sunder must needs be taken tripping & founde liers, for how should yee agree in that yee knowe not, nay in that which is not.

you plainlie, that your late Popes and Church of Rome since three hundred, or three hundred and seventie yeares last past, knewe not what to hold, nor what to affirme touching the fourme of consecration. And therefore in this your new doctrine there is neither vnitie, antiquitie, vniversalitie (not veritie) with which termes you so long haue deceived the people.

(a) The Pope & Church of Rome (as this Canon testifieth) was of opinion, that the Priest must recite *verba Evangelistarum*, beginning at *qui pridie, &c. in hoc ergo creatur illud corpus*. The Priest must recite the whole words of the three Evangelists, beginning at the day before he suffered.

Out of which we may see that this Pope will haue the words of the three Evangelists, which containe the causes and effects of the whole institution, and not *hoc est enim corpus meum* onelie, &c.

(a) *Distin. 2. de Consecratione sub figura in fine.*

Againe, there is vsed a most shamefull and blasphemous word, *Creatur*, vnlesse you will haue Christ to become a creature, and the Priest to become a creator: your maister the Pope was too forgetfull that this had not been dashed into his *Index expurgatorius*.

But I must alleadge another Pope to contradict this Popes opinion. In another age there was a Pope, who with the Church of Rome, held that there was an invisible Priest that consecrated and changed those visible creatures into the bodie and bloud of Christ, not by vertue of those knowne wordes, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, nor by all the words of the three Evangelists, as the other Pope did, but *secreta potestate*, by a secrete and hidden power, which you visible Priestes knowe not. This Pope will haue an invisible Priest to make a visible sacrifice; and you Iesuits and Priests will haue a visible Priest, to make the invisible bodie and bloud of Christ. What is more contrarie and absurd then this? This Pope hath brained your *hoc est enim corpus meum*,

De Consec. distinct. 2. Canon quia corpus, page 432.

being

[illegible] your ordinarie consecration, and records all o[illegible] Popes and you Iesuits and Priests for hereticks, [illegible] holding that *hoc est corpus meum* doth consecrate. But yet I will bee so holde to aske this Pope this [illegible]stion, Who is that invisible Priest? where is that [illegible]iest? what is his secret power? doth it consist in spea[illegible]ng, or crossing, or both, or in neither, or in some o[illegible]er dumbe shewes. The holie Scriptures teach no [illegible]ch Poest speake of no such secret power, and so [illegible] is a fable as is the rest, and no sure foundation for [illegible] Catholickes to sticke too, therefore I wish that [illegible] well minded Catholickes of this kingdome would [illegible] beleeue this vncertaine vanitie, but sticke to [illegible]hrists written veritie.

If this discourse of Popes you had not forewarned in an vnknowne tounge, the Catholicks had forsaken Pope, Preiste, and Rome, long since.

I will adde one Pope more, whose opinion I know [illegible] will not gainsay, for if you should, I must come [illegible] you with an old schoole point, *Contra negantem [illegible] non est disputandum.* This is Pope *Innocentius* [illegible] third of famous memorie, vnder the warmth of [illegible]hose wings, your transubstantiation in the Synode [illegible] *Lateranae* was hatched, at least one thousand and [illegible] hundred yeares after Christs ascention: This Pope [illegible]cords three severall opinions touching consecration, [illegible] one contrarie to another, The first holds, it is made [illegible] *Benedixit*: The second sort teach, that after *bene*[illegible]*dictio*, when either is by the Priest made some print on [illegible] bread, as it were by crossing & some word spoken o[illegible] & to the bread, then *hoc est enim corpus meum* conse[illegible] whosoever saith nay. And this sort holds that it is [illegible]*redibile*) credible, that Christ first delivered the bread, [illegible] then consecrated the bread, which things make [illegible] fingring and blowing vpon or over the bread more palpable, because one must hold the Elements while you enchaunte them, rather then consecrate them. The third opinion crosseth both the other, which is, that Christ consecrated *vertute divina*, by his

De sacro Altaris mysterio lib. 4. cap. 6. page. 165. 166.

his diuine vertue, and afterward laid downe for posterities a forme, after which they should bleſſe or consecrate.

Thus there were three ſeuerall opinions that this Pope ſpake of, yet it ſeemeth he liked but one of them, which was the ſecond, which he ſeemeth to iuſtifie in the chapter following.

Magiſter Sent. lib. 4. diſt. 8. fol. 56. which are alledged out of Ambroſe:

But *magiſter Sententiarum* commeth neerer the matter, and asketh a queſtion to make the matter pliane, *cur ſacratio quibus fit verbis. Attende qua ſunt verba accepta & comedite, accepite bibite, &c.* with what words is conſecration made? giue attention, theſe be the words, *Take yee, eate yee all of this, this is my bodie, take yee and drinke yee, this is my blood, drinke yee all of this.*

Heere you ſee that this maiſter checks Pope & Prelate, for none of all theſe twentie and odde opinions ever put in theſe wordes, *Take yee, eate yee, take yee drinke yee,* as the words of Chriſt, but as the words of your Canon. And that theſe words be not neceſſarie parts of Chriſts inſtitution, but onelie shew the vſe of the inſtitution, but that is neither Canoniſtll not Catholicke. And if you liſt at your leiſure to read Cardinall *Fr. Conſtantius Sarnanus* his worke, intituled *Summa Theologica*, dedicated to this Pope *Clement* the eight now liuing, you ſhall ſee that he repeats other leuerall iarres that are now among your Romane Prelates touching conſecration as contrarie as theſe, and therefore as abſurd as the former.

Printed at Rome. 1592. pag. 844. 145. 246.

Now Gentlemen, how can you ſalue this ſore, and reconcile theſe iarres, Doctours, Schoolemen, Canoniſts, Text and Gloſſe, Popes, and great Prelates diſſenting moſt ſhameſullie about conſecration, none of them relying vpon Chriſt plaine inſtitution, and therefore be hold their deſerued confuſion.

Now blame not vs for diſcouering your diſcords, and for forſaking your errors, but blame your Doc-

tors,

ours, Schoo'men, Friers, Monkes, Legendaries, Canonists, your Popes Canons, and your owne Masse-book, these are come to our hands, we haue read their workes, and discovered some hundreds of their heresies, and sent them to the view of the Catholickes But howsoever you blame vs, God and the world will blame you, in keeping the people from reading Gods booke, and good writers, which would instruct and confirme them in true religion, and revoke them from your grosse superstition. Thus much concerning the uncertaintie, absurditie, and blasphemie of your consecration. Now the true Apostolicall consecration is this, when the elements of bread and wine are set apart from their common vse, and applied to wholie vse, according to Gods word.

What true consecration is which the Gospellers teach.

And when the lawful minister hath taught the prepared cōmunicants the grievousnes of their sinnes: the greatnes of Gods wrath: the sufficiencie of Christs merits fully to appease the same: the nature of the Sacrament, which is a commemoration of that passion, the office of faith to apprehend and applie Christs merits promised in the word, and tendred in the due administration of the Sacraments, then is there I say, a right consecration of the Sacrament. Now whether this consecration of yours, is warranted by Christ his words, let the indifferent Reader iudge, and with the truest & auncient opinion ioyne. Thus much concerning your imagined & new stamped *consecration*. Now to your second piller, which is, *transubstansiation*. First, I must tel you in this, as in the former, that the term is new, lately invented & cōpounded by your selues, & as your consecration was never found in the new Testament, so transubstansiation was never found in the new not old. No, I do not remember that in all my Grammatical travels & studies, that ever I read it, I can shew you Dictionaries many, & Grammers moe, of divers prints,

Transubstansiation

Yet we contend with you not for names and words, but for points & articles

and of faith,

and in diuerse ages, printed in seuerall Vniuersities of Christendome, one none of them makes mention of this word *transubstantiare*, much lesse of the sence, which is to chaunge substances of seuerall kinds, one substance into another. But briefly, as the word cannot be found in Gods booke nor ancient Doctors: so the sence hath neither warrant from holie scriptures, nor Catholicke writers.

For this is your opinion, that after consecration (which yet you know not what it is) the substance of bread and wine should be conuerted into the naturall bodie and bloud of Christ, the accidents of bread and wine, as whitenesse, roundnesse, breadth, weight, fauor and taste of them onely remaining.

You may allooue and to as good a purpose, proue a transaccidentation as a transubstantiation. But as there is no change of the former, so not of the latter, but a meere Poets fable, and therefore friuolous. And whereas the Fathers vse these words, *change, turning, mutation, transelementation*, they alwaies expound themselues in their seuerall workes, that it is a changing of the vse, not of the substance: neither can you shew anie one father that euer ment such a change, of one substance into another: for euerie change of one thing into another, carrieth not with it at all transubstantiation of one substance into another; for there may be a change without conuersion of substances, but conuersion of substances cannot bee without a change: for there is as much difference betwixt change and transubstantiation, as betwixt the generall & the speciall: for *change* is the generall, and containes vnder it transubstantiation: but not contrariwise.

And as there is a change of substances, so there is a change of accidents, to wit, of qualities, of times, of places, of habits, and such other like things, according to their natures, and to the predicaments vnder the which

which they are comprehended. These Logicall rudiments I hope you haue not forgotten.

Our regeneration is a change, not substantiall, but occidentall, that is: it is not a change of the substance of our bodies and soules into anie other substance, but the change is in qualitie: which is, from vice to vertue, from sinne to righteousnesse, &c. and this our change now in question is sacramentall, not substantiall, of the vse of the creatures, not of the substance.

We confes a change of name, & of vse, but onelie during the action.

But if you will needes haue a change of substances, speake like schollers, and tell me for my learning, in what predicament I shall seeke it, and yet I thinke I shall never finde it. But I will not bee tedious in transubstantiation, seeing the great Rabbynes of Rome can no more agree vpon this, then they could about consecration, as also because we haue confuted it in such places, where we prooue *bread* to remaine after consecration: for so manie fathers as prooue *bread* to remaine after consecration, confute transubstantiation. I will onelie giue the best minded Catholickes a tasse of the rest of your late School-doctors, by alleadging one Grand-captain in stead of the rest, whose words be these. *Si tandem queritur qualis sit illa conversio, an formalis, an substantialis, vel alterius generis, definire non sufficio*: But if it be asked mee (saith this your great Moderator) what kinde of change is made in the Sacrament, whether it be formall, or substantiall, or of anie other kinde, I am not able to define it vnto you.

not after to be a sacrament, no more then water in the font after that baptisme is finished by the minister.

magister Sent. lib. 4. dist. 11. pag. 58.

Will you heare your owne friend *Cuthb. Tounstall* Bishop of *Dirrhom* deliver his opinion, *de modo, quo id fieret fortasse satis erat curiosum quemque suæ relinquere coniecturæ, sicut liberum fuit ante concilium Lateranum*. Of the maner of this change or conversion how it might be done, perhaps it had been better to leaue every man that would be curious to his own

de Eucharistia lib. 1. pag. 46.

opinion or coniecture, as it was before the Counsell of *Laterane* left at libertie.

Is this your antiquitie, vniuersalitie, and consent? you see it is a farting nouelrie, voide of veritie. Why then will you take vpon you to teach that which you neuer learned, and peruade the Catholickes to beleeue that which the chiefest on your side maketh a doubt of? nay, all of your side cannot proouue: nay which is in deed but a fable without trueth, for one thousand & two hundred yeares after Christ neuer heard of: And therefore seeing it is neither Apostolicall nor Catholicke, no mans conscience is bounde to beleeue it.

Absurdities follow the graunting of transubstantiation.

Now I will onelie shewe some grosse absurdities that followe the graunting of it, and so proceed to the rest.

This fable of transubstantiation ouerthroweth sundrie articles of our faith, and therefore it is abhominable. It teacheth a new conception of Christ to be made of bread by a sinfull priest, and euery day, & in euerie place where it pleaseth the priest, contrarie to the Article of our faith, which is, that Christ was conceaued by the holie Ghost, and borne of the blessed virgin, and but once: for such a Christ as you tender to the poore ignorant Catholickes is not a true Christ, neither can be, for manie respects, which are before in the beginning alleadged. Secondlie, if Christ be in the Sacrament, he is not then ascended, and so there is another article of our faith destroyed by this damnable fable. And thirdlie, if thee be couchant or dormant in the pixe, then the Scriptures deceiue vs, in telling vs hee shall come from heaven to iudge both quicke and dead, & so another article of our faith is ouerthrowne. And if your doctrine were true, Christ should haue eaten himselfe corporally, but you confesse he did eat himselfe (a) spiritually. If your doctrine of transubstantiation were true, then the Lords supper were

3 (a) Iosephus Angles pag. 230. conclusione secunda. 5

were no Sacrament, & the reason is this, for every Sacrament consisteth of the outward signe, & the inward thing signified, & they must both still remaine during the outward action of the Sacrament. Now if bread (which is the visible outward part of the Sacrament) be changed into Christs bodie, then there is no sacrament, because there remaines but one part of the Sacrament, (which is the thing signified, & then you vtterlie deceive the people, which tell them it is the Sacrament of the bodie, when it is no Sacrament at all. Againe, another absurditie followes vppon it: for if the substance of bread be changed, then there is no proportion or analogie betwixt the signe and the thing signified, because accidents cannot nourish. For the likenesse or resemblance betwixt bread and Christ, consisteth chiefliein this, that as bread nourisheth the bodie, so Christs bodie mistically nourisheth the soule: but if the substance of bread be changed into another substance, then the proportion and propertie is so changed, that it must cease to be the thing for which it was first ordained, and so the best you would make of the Sacrament is but a shadow without a substance. 6

Another vnreasonable absurditie will follow, that Christ hath two bodies, one of bread made by the Priest, another of the blessed virgin conceived by the holie Ghost. 7

Againe, if this owne bodie shall be in manie places at once, that is contrarie to a naturall bodie, and all reason of learning, as the other of religion: and by this your new thirteenth Article of youre new faith, you would maintaine the being of qualities without a subiect, and the being of quantities without a substance, which both are impossible. But because the opinion is false and forged without Scripture or testimonie of auncient father, I will alleadge no more absurditities at this time till I be urged. 8

See

See now the fruits of your fained transubstantiation, not full foure hundred yeares olde, & yet forsooth you teach it is Apostolicall and Catholicke, whereas it lackes one thousand and two hundred yeares of that age.

But he that list to see the shifts and wranglings of your Schoolmen to vphold this rotten Romish heresie, let him read *Guillermus*, & *Innocentius* the third, a Pope, parent, and patrone of this fable, the first Canon of the second distinction, where you shall finde in the Glosse there, *varia sunt opiniones*. That in the Popes Court and in his Consistorie, there bee diuers opinions touching transubstantiation, yet the denyall of it, or the contradicting of the Popes opinion, was then (a) no death, though in those merciless daies of Spanish *Philip*, and Romish *Marie*, it was made the thirteenth Article of our faith, and it had been lesse daunger to haue denied those twelue old articles of our old faith, then this one of your new faiths: for the one was dispensed with for monie, but the denyall of the other was punished with death without mercie. But you will replie and say, notwithstanding the dissentions aforesaid, yet Christs words be true, he cannot lie, he hath said, *hoc est corpus meum, this is my bodie*, therefore it is his bodie.

Lib 4. sent. fol. 257. Innocentius 3. de. sacro Altaris mysterio lib. 4 cap. 20. per totum. Distinct. de consecr. distinct 2. canon. 1. pag. 429.

(a) *Denyall of Transubstantiation in Rome was no death.*

We confesse these words to be Christs words, and therefore true, but the litterall sence is yours, & therefore false. But that I will not bee tedious vnto you, I could shew you as manie seuerall opinions dissenting about the meaning of *hoc*, *est* and *corpus*, as I haue done in the premisses: but that the Catholicke shall know there is no such vnitie nor veritie in your doctrine, as you confidentlie (but vntrulie) haue taught them, therefore I will giue them but a taste till some other time, onelie pointing you and them to their Authors and places, and then read aduisedlie, and

iudge

judge without partiall affection.

This Frier you heard latelie recited your severall [illegible] touching consecration: now heare him with your patience to deliver his and other severall opinions touching the exposition of these three words severallie, *hoc, est, corpus.*

Iosepus Angles de Essentialibus Euch. pag. 114. 115. 116.

The first opinion is, that this demonstratiue pronoune *hoc*, must bee referred not to the bread, but to the bodie of Christ, that this should be the sence, *hoc est, &c. id est corpus: est corpus meum.* That is, this my bodie, is my bodie: but how absurd this is, let the young Sophisters in the Schooles giue their censures.

1. *Iosepus*

But the second opinion is of *Bonaventura*, who saith this, pronoune *hoc*, must be referred to the bread that must be converted into Christs bodie, but not to Christs bodie.

2. *Bonauentura.*

The third opinion is *Occhams*, and he is of opinion with the first.

3. *Occam in lib. 4.*

There followeth three other learned mens opinions contrarie to all the former, and say statlie that this demonstratiue *hoc*, must not be referred to note either the bread or the bodie of Christ, but that this might be the sence, *hoc ens vel hac substantia, quæ continetur sub speciebus, &c.* This thing or this substance which is contained vnder the accidents of bread, is my bodie: but how well these opinions with their straunge Logicall manner of reasoning will content the learned Priests and Iesuits, I would faine know? for this I am sure, they sound not either of diuinitie or learning. But this Frier for a farewell concludes, pag. 118. *pronoun hoc, nihil.* This pronoune *hoc* signifieth nothing, till the last sillable *vm*, be pronounced.

1. *S. Thom.*
2. *Ricar.*
3. *Scotus.*

Nec panem nec corpus sub ratione corporis, sed corpus Christi sub ratione entis vel Indiuidui, &c.

Pope *Innocentius* the third saith, that *hoc* signifieth neither bread, nor Christs bodie, because the whole words of consecration were not spoken: vnlesse saith he, you will say the Priest consecrates at this word

lib. 4 pag. 182 de sacro Altaris mysterio, cap. 17

Benedixit

Hoc, nihil demonstrat. In the same pag. marke this you Iesuits & priests.

Benedixit, he blessed. But the Pope saith, *hoc* signifie nothing, and his reason is, that the Priest sheweth noteth nothing, because he vseth *hoc est, &c.* not by way of demonstration, but by way of cursorie repetition: so then, this Pope will haue this fence, *hoc est corpus meum*, that is, nothing is my bodie. But in the three of the last lines of that chapter, his wisedom changed his minde & said, *this is my bodie*, that is, whatsoever is vnder the formes of bread is my bodie. Is not this thinke you deepe divinitie for a Pope? You may see herein how the Pope vseth shamefull shifts to cover his sensible errors, and to deceiue Christs little flocke.

In his Marc. Anton. Con.

Stephen Gardner living but latelie, seeing every man opinion expounding what *hoc* should be, heed disliketh them all, and saith, it signifieth *individuum vagum*, as if Christ had said, *This* (but what it is I cannot tell, but it must of necessitie be somewhat) *is my bodie*.

De consec. dist. 2. can. Timorem. Glossa ibidem.

But I will conclude with your owne Popes Canon and Glosse, which you hold for Canonicall, though indeed hereticall, *solet quaeri quid demonstratur per pronomen hoc*. It is a common question what is meant by this pronoune *this*, whether bread, or the bodie of Christ? not bread, for that is not the bodie of Christ: nor yet the bodie of Christ, for it appereath not that there is anie transubstansiation, till the words bee all pronounced, yea the last sillable *um*. To this question this must be answered: That by the word *this*, nothing is meant, but it is there put materially, without anie signification at all. See now whither you are brought, or rather whither haue you brought Gods people, from trueth to falsehood: if *hoc* signifieth nothing, where then is your transubstansiation. For if in that word which should first worke in the change there bee no mention of bread, how can that which is no way comprised in them, be chaunged by them, & so you speake

against

gainſt your ſelues. Againe, as you are rent in ſun-dry opinions touching *hoc*, ſo alſo are you touching *eſt*: when you ſaw that *eſt* would not ſerue in his proper *Euangelicall and Apoſtolicall ſignification*, then you gaue him a new expoſition. For *Bonaventure* ſeeing that *eſt* (as Chriſt and *Paul* meant it) would not fit their purpoſe, then hee of purpoſe expounded it by *fit, vt ſit ſenſus, panis ſit corpus meum*, that it might be thus in ſence, The bread is made my bodie. Yet *Ockam* hee likes not *Bonaventures Fit*, becauſe hee thinkes it is too groſſe and too falſe: and therefore he will expound *eſt* by *erit*, that it may carrie with it this ſence: this ſhall be my bodie, but (ſaith he) it is a verie raſh and brainſicke opinion, and alleadgeth as brainſicke a reaſon, as there you may ſee.

What eſt ſignifieth, there is great variance amongſt the Romiſh Prelats. Eſt 1. Fit, Eſt, *eſt verbum annuntiativum non conſtitutivum.* Eſt 1. erit Ioſeph but Angles in loco prædicto. pag. 345.

Yet *Caietanus* the Cardinall *de Euchariſtia cap.* 7. pag. 104. col. 2. C. D. denieth *eſt* to haue anie ſuch ſignification, vnleſſe it be in metaphors and parables. But leſt that I ſhuld be too offenſiue vnto you, I could deliver ſo many ſeveral opinions of yours, touching the *prædicat corpus:* one ſaith it muſt bee meant of Chriſtes bodie glorified, no ſaith another, that is falſe: but it muſt be vnderſtood of his bodie, as it was before his paſſion. And a third opinion obiects certaine doubts againſt both the former,

Magiſter Sententiarum lib. 4. *diſtinct.* 12. *pago.* 60. deliuers foure ſeverall opinions, *de fractione & partibus.*

Now Gentlemen, I appeale to your conſciences (if they be not cauteriated) whether you haue deale well with the ignorant Catholickes of this land, in perſwading them that in all your doctrine there is conſent without iarres, antiquitie without innovation, and vniverſalitie without limitation, whereas there is nothing but iarres, diſcords & diſſentions, in your cõſecration, in your tranſubſtantiatiõ, & in every word almoſt,

may perticle, as *hoc*, and *est*, be so wrested by your construction, that you haue brought both their proper significations to plaine destruction.

Is this exposition Catholicke? what auncient father ever expounded it so? let the Catholickes know, or else they with vs, will iudge, neither you nor your doctrine Catholicke. Will you follow a foolish Frier, an ignorant Abbot, a late vpstart Pope or Priest that writ (and wrested) within these foure hundred yeares, and forsake Scriptures and the auncient Doctours of the Church? Now let the indifferent minded Catholikes be iudges whether you or we e haue antiquity consent and veritie on our sides, And who differs from Scriptures, & fathers; from, & amongst themselues not onelie in one point of religion, but almost in every perie point and particle of doctrine. Thus much concerning your discords amongst your selues, and all against the auncient Apostolicall and Catholick truth.

Hoc est corpus meum: expoun by scripture.

Now to conclude this matter, I will shewe plainly by scriptures, that *hoc est corpus meum* can haue no such sence as you teach, which is, that bread is not by this or anie other words transubstantiated or changed into Christs bodie and blould, but that bread remaineth after sanctification, or (as you say) consecration, and that the scriptures speaking of Christs bodie and of the bread, speake distinctlie, not confusedlie, that is, they doe divide them, not confound them giving to either of them their severall nature and propertie, yea after consecration. And whereas we haue now heard too much of the jarres of your late Popes and writers voide of vnitie and veritie: Now let vs heare the holie scriptures expound *hoc est corpus meum*, plainlie and truelie by the Evangelists and *Paul*, who knew best Christs meaning. Vpon whose exposition all Christians may and must onelie rest satisfied in spite of Pope and poperie.

And

And firſt we will prooue it from the difference of the ſigne and the thing ſignified. The ſcriptures when they ſpeak of bread they ſpeak actiuely, *He gaue.*

But when they ſpeake of Chriſts naturall bodie, they ſpeake paſſiuelie, *Is giuen.*

When they ſpeake of bread, they ſpeake actiuelie, *He brake it.*

But when they ſpeake of Chriſts body, they ſpeake paſſiuelie, *Which is broken.*

When they ſpeake of bread, they ſay, *To you.*

But when they ſpeake of Chriſts naturall bodie, they ſay, *For you.*

Likewiſe when they ſpeake of wine, they ſpeake actiuely: *He gaue,*

But when they ſpeake of Chriſt his bloud, they ſpeake paſſiuelie, *Is ſhed,*

When they ſpeake of the wine, they ſay, *To them,*

But when they ſpeake of Chriſts bloud, they ſpeake, *For you,* or, *for many,*

When they ſpeak of the cup, they ſpeake, *In remembrance of me.*

But when they ſpeake of Chriſts naturall bloud, they ſpeake, *For the remiſſione of ſinne.*

So when Chriſt ſpeaketh actiuelie, as, *he gaue, hee brake,* it is alwaies ſpoken of the ſacrament But when he ſpeaketh paſſiuelie, *vvhich is giuen, vvhich is broken, vvhich is ſhed,* and *for you,* not *to you,* then he ſpeakes of his naturall bodie given and broken on the croſſe. And this rule is a plaine and ſure rule to direct vs in

Dabit, matth. 26 26.

Datur. Luc 22.19

Frangit. Luc. 22.19

Frangitur. 1. Cor. 11. 24.

Dis. marke. 14. 22

Pro vobis. 1. Cor. 11. 24.

Dabit, marke. 14 23

Effunditur. Luc. 22. 20.

Dis. matth. 26. 27

Pro multis pro vobis. Luc. 22. 20 matth. 26. 26.

In meã commemorationem. 1. Cor 11. 24.

In remiſſionem peccatorum. Mat. 26. 28.

and to the true vnderstanding of *hoc est corpus meum*, *This is my bodie*, In which plaine pathes of the holie Scriptures if you would walke, you might be preserved from wandring.

Bread and wine remain after consecration by Christ his testimony, therefore trãsubstantiation is a forged and false fable, invented by new Rome to support your new heresies of Christs carnall presence.

Thus you see how distinctlie Christ disioynes them, sundring them with their soverall properties, the signe from the thing signified, not confounding them as you vntrulie teach, yea and after that Christ vttered *hoc est corpus meum*, which you call your consecration. Now let vs compare the phrase and words that the holie Ghost vseth in both the new Testament & the old, and then you will say they are so like, that they are rather borrowed of the old testament, then instituted in the new, and so of necessitie seeing they are both Sacraments, and of like words, and ordained by one Author, and to one end, they wust needs haue one sence, so that the one will best expound the other, and the one being Sacramentall and relatiue, the other cannot be Grammaticall and proper. As it is said in the old (a) Testament of the sacramẽt of circumcision, *hoc est pactum meum*, this is my covenant. So it is said in the new (b) testamẽt by the same spirit, *hoc est corpus meum*, *this it my bodie*, but as by those words like to these in syllables, sound, and sence, there was no transubstantiation of the peece of flesh of the foreskin that was cut off, into Gods covenant made with his Church, so there is no naturall nor miraculous chaunge made of anie part of the bread or wine into Christs bodie and bloud.

(a) *Gen.* 17 10.

(b) *Matth.* 26. 26.

Exod. 12. 1. *Cor.* 11. 24.

And as it was said of the Paschall Lambe, *hoc erit vobis in memoriam*, *this shall be to you a remembrance*, so it is said of the Lords Supper, *Doe this in remembrance of me*

Exod. 24. 8.

And as it was said in the olde Testament, *hic est sanguis fœderis*, *This is the bloud of the covenant*, yet was not the couenant but a signe of the covenant.

So is

So is it said by Christ himselfe, This cup is the new Testament in my bloud, yet the cup was neither the Testament, nor the bloud, but a signe representation, and rememberance of Christs bloud. Luc. 22. 20.

And the new Testament is an obligation or bond wherein God for his part binds himselfe with most free covenaunte: and seales it with word, oath and sacraments, that hee will receiue into his protection and favour the beleever and penitent. And the beleever and repentant of their parts, binde themselues by like indented covenants, to performe vnto his sacred Maiestie, a liuelie and steadfaste faith with holy obedience. Rom. 8. 5.

Now the cup or the wine in the cup, is a representation or commemoration vnto vs of this covenant of grace made in the newe Testament, as the Paschall Lambe and the bloud of beasts were signes of Gods covenant in the old Testament. This may suffice for the plaine and true vnderstanding of these words, *this is my bodie*, and *this is my bloud*, beeing expounded according to the holie scriptures. Now to your first proofe out of saint *Paul*,

1. Cor. 11. { *This is my bodie which shall bee delivered for you: whoso doth eate vnworthelie. &c. shall be guiltie of the bodie and bloud of Christ.* Catho. Priests.

A Most learned writer in the like case, brings in an Athenian historie of *Thrasylaus* (a frantick man amongst the Greekes) who whensoever he saw anie ships arriue in the harbor thought them all his own, & tooke an Inventorie of their wares & bad the welcome home verie ioyfully, as if they had bin his own seruants & ships. After the same maner (pardon the cõparison) you deal in the proofe of this question. Rider. Athenæus Deipnosophist. lib. 12.

for whereſoeuer you finde in ſcriptures or fathers, *hoc eſt corpus meum, this is my bodie*, or, *this is my blood*, or, *my flesh is meat trulie, &c.* or, *except yee eate the fleſh of the ſonne of man and drinke his blood, &c.* or, *the bread vvhich I will giue is my fleſh*, or the like tropicall or ſacramentall phraſe, which euer carrieth with it a ſpirituall ſence, preſentlie you clap hands, lift vp Stentorian voices, and crie to the Catholickes againſt vs poore heretickes, that all theſe texts of Scriptures and teſtimonies of Fathers are on your ſide, and prooue your carnall preſence: and condeme our opinion as hereticall and damnable, and then you regiſter in your note-bookes (as in an Inventorie) all theſe prooſes for your owne proper evidence, when as God knowes, you are neither Owners, Marchants, nor faithfull Factors. And it ſhall be directlie prooved, that theſe texts of Scriptures and teſtimonies of Fathers, belong no more to the prooſe of your carnall preſence, then the Merchants ſhips and goods of *Athens* belonged to franticke *Thraſylaus*. But now to prooue that I ſpeak, that the Catholickes may ſee, (yea and let maiſter *Henry Fyſſimon* trulie cenſure) wee ſpeake nothing without prooſe, I will beginne to examine your ſlips and ſleights in this place of the 1. *Cor.* 11.

Firſt you bring a peece of a verſe, ſo much as you thinke by the ſound of your eare will fit your purpoſe: then you cut off the beginning and ending of the ſame verſe, which would expound the Apoſtles meaning, and overthrow your opinion. Then you ioyne a peece of the 27 verſe with the 24. verſe, and overskip the 25 and 26. verſes, which (all that you left out, and cut off) doth firſt deliuer Chriſts inſtitution: ſecondly, expounds his owne meaning in everie particuler point that is in controverſie betwixt vs: and thirdlie, overthrowes your opinions. Now, what mooved you thus to mangle, cut off, diſioynt, and diſmember this place

of *Paul*

of *Paul* (as you did with the text before) let the Reader after my examination of your errors, iudge.

But first I must deliver you this generall rule observed of all sound Divines, that all the Evangelists and Apostles doctrine, being pend by one spirit, doe agree in the matter of the Sacrament, one expounding another, as partlie you heard a little before. So that the three Evangelists must not be expounded to contradict *Paul*, nor *Paul* expounded to contradict them, but all dulie and trulie in the spirit of humilitie, being examined according to the Canon and rule of the word of God, you shall finde neither darknesse in speech, nor difficultie in sence, but that the simplest may know Christs meaning.

You should haue begunne at the 23. verse, and so to the end of the 29. verse, and that had been plaine dealing. Christs institution penned by *Paul*, delivers us foure observations. First, Christ his action. Secondlie, Christes precept. Thirdlie, Christs promise. Fourthlie, Christes caution.

1. Christes action. { *He gaue thankes, brake bread, & tooke the cup, &c.*

2. Christes precept. { 1. *Take yee, eate yee.*
2. *This do as often as yee drinke it*, and both, *in remembrance of me.*
3. *The minister must shewe and preach the Lords death till he come.*

3. Christes promise. { 1. *This is my body which is broken for you.*
2. *This is the new Testament in my blood.*

4. Christes caution or caveat, *Whosoever shall eate this bread, or drinke this cup unworthelie, shall bee guiltie of the bodie and blood of the Lord.*

Thus you see plainlie without anie dismembring or curtalling, Christs action, precept, promise, & caution delivered out of the text,

Our

Out of which place I obserue for the Catholike's better instruction and your confutation, two things against you in this your skipping and curtalling of the text. First, the comforts you conceale from them by this mangling of the text. Secondlie, the errours you still hold them in, in concealing the most part of the text, first by following your Latten translation, & neglecting the holie tongue (the Greeke), wherein the holie Ghost pend this institution. You translate, *Which shall be delivered for you*, for, *which is broken for you*. Out of which I note, first you change the tense, that is in the Greeke, that is, the present tense, for so wee haue it, and you follow the Latten translation, which is the future tense, and therefore not so comfortable. Christ vseth a sweet figure of the time present for the time to come, to assure our soules and consciences that whatsoever Christ promiseth, is as surelie to bee performed (in his appointed time) as if it were alreadie done. And this tense Christ vsed to take all doubts from his disciples, who in respect of their vnworthinesse might iustlie haue doubted, that Christ would not haue died and shed his precious bloud for them, they being such vnprofitable seruants, and miserable sinners. But to take away that doubt from them and the Church, now hee assures both, that whatsoever is promised by him, is as sure to be done, as if it were alreadie done. And this staieth Christs Church and everie perticular member of the same from distrusts, doubts, grudgings, &c. in and vnder their severall crosses, because they know there is a ioyfull Iubile, and freedome for them purchased and prepared, and shall as surelie be accomplished, as if now it weere performed.

Enallage.

Now your altring of this particle, (*is*,) depriueth vs of all this comfort. Againe, you following still your corrupt Latten translation, say, *delivered for you*, whereas you should say as the Greeke is, and as Christ saith,

Broken

broken for you, for this word *broken* is more Emphatical and piercing then *delivered*, for it is one thing for a man to be delivered or to be betraied for me, another thing to be broken in peeces for me. Out of this I obserue first the greatneſſe of my ſinne: ſecondlie, the kindnes and exceeding loue of my Saviour.

In the first, that Christs birth and life (though both innocent) was not ſufficient to cleanſe my ſinne. In the ſecond, Christ would vndergoe ſhamefull buffets on the face, pricking of thornes vpon his head, piercing nailes into his hands and feete, a bloudie ſpeare into his bleſſed ſide, before mans ſinne could bee ſatisfied, Gods wrath appeaſed, Sathan, death and hell conquered: this our liuing Christ would haue his bodie broken for vs, he would not leaue one ſigh in his ſoule for our ſakes, nor one drop of bloud in his bodie vnſhed for our ſinnes. Theſe comforts are expreſſed by this word *broken*, which are not, nor can be gathered by this word *delivered*. Another comfort is concealed from the Catholickes in omitting the 25. verſe, in theſe words, *The newe Teſtament in my bloud.* Out of which everie man may gather theſe comforts to himſelfe by particular application. First, that I am not a ſtraunger to Christ, but one of his younger brethren, and not onelie well knowne vnto him: but alſo as well beloved of him: which appeareth in this, that hee did not onelie remember me in his laſt will, but alſo moſt freelie and liberallie bequeathed vnto my ſoule and bodie moſt precious Legacies, where wee may finde them regiſtred & moſt ſafelie kept in Gods booke, and daylie pronounced in our Creed, as remiſſion of ſinnes of both guilt & puniſhment: peace of conſcience in this life: at the latter day riſing of my bodie from death and duſt: & afterwards life eternall both to ſoule and bodie. Theſe Legacies be bequeathed and contained in this Teſtament, which he hath not onely ſealed out-

Math. 26. 40. *Heb.* 2. 12. 13. 17. *Ioh.* 10. 27.

wardlie with Sacraments, but also inwardlie with his bloud by faith, to assure vs of the performance of his promise, and therefore he addeth *in my bloud*: so that all other Testaments, Wils, Bulls or Pardons, which are not sealed with Christs bloud, but with lead or wax, are but counterfeit labels stitcht to Christs testament, by some false forgeries of periured Notaries, wherin they doe falselie promise remission of sinnes and the kingdome of heaven. These deceivers must be told, as *Peter* told *Ananias*: *Why hath Sathan fild thy heart that thou shouldest lie, not onelie vnto men, but also vnto the holie Ghost?* In *Ananias* heart there was a wicked conceit, in his practises a wicked deceit, and for his reward a suddaine death. You Chaplens of the Pope, doe tell the poore people many waies to haue remission of their sinnes besides Christes Testament, and Christes bloud, (which I will deliver particularlie if I be vrged) but you are deceived, and so you deceiue them, and because you would keepe them still blinde, that they should neither see your deceit, nor their owne danger, therefore you kept this comfortable clause from them, *The new Testament in my bloud*, without which there is neither remission of sins, nor saving of soules. Another comfort you conceale from the deuout meditation of everie good Christian, which is, *In remembrance of me.*

Acts 5.3

Suetonius Plutach.

We read in histories after *Iulius Cæsar* was slaine, *Marcus Anthonius* made an Oration to the people of Rome, in which he shewed *Cæsars* loue, and painted out verie Rhetoricallie *Cæsars* bountie to them while he lived, but in the heat of his speech he made a poule, and shewed the *Cæsars* robes sprinkled with his princelie bloud, shed by the bloudie hand of his cruell and malicious enemies: which when the Cittizens saw, (remembring his loue) presentlie they ranne vpon the murtherers and slew them. Did the Cittizens of Rome

(being

(being Pagans) revenge *Cæsars* death vppon his enemies, onelie remembring his loue and liberalitie? Then with what Christian courage and spirituall manhood, ought we that professe to bee Christians, revenge our Christs death vpon his cruell, bloudie, and malicious enemies, which so mercilesly put him to death? & these enemies be our sinnes, for he died for our sinnes: which, let vs mortifie, nay murther them: let vs kill surfetting by abstinence, adulterie by continencie, crueltie by mercie, hatred by loue, covetousnesse by almes, superstition by religion, &c. These and the like consorts of sinne put our *Cæsar* (Christ) to death. Therefore when we heare not *Marcus Anthonius*, but anie man of God out of the booke of God, preach vnto vs Christs bloudie passion that died in our quarrell, and shed his bloud for our sinnes: let the *remembrance* of his precious death and mercifull deliverance, put vs in minde to revenge his death, by killing our sinnes which slew our Saviour, and endevour to serue him with all thankfulnesse in a life spirituall, who hath delivered vs freelie from death eternall. Now see what comfort the Catholickes loose for the lacke of this Apostolicall *remembrance of me*, and this commeth by your omitting of that you should not passe without expressing the true tenour of it, as you received it of the Lord, for the profit of his Church. Thus much touching the spirituall comforts concealed from the people by your skipping of Scriptures: now let vs see what errours purposelie you seeke to cover by this course.

Rom. 4. the last verse.

1. Cor. 11. 22.

First, if you had put downe these words, *In remembrance of me*, and, *till I come*, these two had overthrowne your *carnall presence*, for if the bread & wine must bee received in remembrance of Christ, then bread and wine are not *Christ* substantiallie, corporallie, and by way of transubstantiation. And if Christ be risen, as the Angell said, and as wee in our Creed confesse,

Errors.

math. 28. 6

confesse, and that we must receiue this Sacrament in his remembrance till he come, then Christ being not come, but to come, is not, nor cannot be carnallie and bodilie vnder the formes of bread and wine, as you fondlie imagine.

And these words (*doe this in remembrance of me*) condemneth all your Masses, that be said in remembrance of *He-Saints* and *Shee-Saints*, and no *Saints*, as your Popes, Bishoppes, and in remembrance of Pilgrims, Mariners, women in trauaill, and murren of beasts. So that all the foresaid Masses said or sung in remembrance of Saints, persons, or diseases, be abhominable, vnlesse you will say (which were damnable to thinke) that those Saintes, Popes, Bishopes, Pilgrims, &c. died for you. But I will cease to speake of those abhominable abuses, vntill I come to the controuersie of the Masse, and yet then nothing but what shall be found in your owne bookes, whose chapters, leaues, pages, if not lines, shall be quoted trulie without fraud or affection. Another errour you would cover in leaping over the 26. verse, in these words, *you doe shew the Lords death till he come: Chrisostome Tom. 4. Hom. 27.* vpon these words: *Facietis commemorationem salutis vestræ & beneficij mei.* This shewing of the Lords death consisteth in preaching and expounding some scripture, wherein the communicants must be instructed of the horrour of their sinne, the greatnesse of Gods loue, the price of the precious merits of Christe blessed passion, which is the remission of sinnes, and our reconciliation to Gods fauour, through his bitter and bloudie passion: And this condemneth your foolish Maygames and Puppet-plaies, in your vaine shewing of Christ his death by such ydle gestures and dumbe shewes, without anie glorification of GODS name, or edification of Christ his people, that I dare boldlie say, and so God willing will plainlie prooue

Missale. Printed at Venice. 1494.

that from

that from your first *Introibo ad Altare Dei*, which is the beginning of your Masse, vntill you come to the last line, *Ite missa est*, there is nothing but magicall superstition, heresie & idolatrie, without veritie or antiquitie. Now let the Catholickes iudge what wrong is done them, when in stead of a comfortable declaration of the Lords death, they haue a histrionicall dumbeshew, without true signification or sence warranted from Christs trueth. And wheras you exclaime against vs, for allowing tropes and figures, and Sacramentall phrases in the handling of this controversie: if you had not concealed this phrase, *This cup is the new Testament in my bloud*, the Catholicks might haue seen your error, and that we in so doing, onelie immitate Christ, whom you should rather follow then the precepts & doctrine of men, whose precepts are no warrants for you nor me to build our faith vpon: nor for the Catholickes to imitate. And you with vs must either say that Christ vsed a double figure, or else most absurdly confesse, that not onelie the wine is transubstantiated & changed into Christs last Testament: but that the challice or cup is transubstantiated into his last testament, & is his testament substantiallie, properlie, & reallie, the accidents of the challice onlie remaining: that is to say, the height, depth, weight, colour, &c. Now if you cannot denie a figure in the challice, how dare you for the like or worse inconvenience denie it in the bread. This you thought to omit, hoping thereby to cover this your error, But it was ill done to deceiue the Catholicks, who so liberallie relieue you, & so dearely haue loved you. And wheras you translate challice for cup, telling the people that the challice cōsecrated by you, is holier then other vsual cups, & that Christ vsed in the institutiō a challice & no vsual drinking-cup, I say in saying thus, you shew your self ignorant in the Greek tongue, wherein Christ spake it, & the Evang. writ it: for they all, & so hath *Paul* *Poterion.*

 but

but one vsuall word which signifieth a vsual drinking cup, and no charmed Challice, as you ydlie & vainly informe the Catholickes.

And now to your 27. verse, which you would couple to your 24. verse, which thus you recite very corruptlie, *whoso doth eate vnworthelie, &c. shall be guiltie of the bodie and bloud of the Lord*, but if you had meant plainlie and trulie, you should haue recited the Apostles words in this manner: *whosoever shall eate this bread and drinke this cup of the Lord vnworthelie shall be guiltie of the bodie and bloud of the Lord.*

Bread remaines after Consecration & therefore no carnall presence, & likewise the Cup & therefore nee Transubstantiation in either.

Out of which I obserue, that you would couer, to conceale that which ouerthrowes your carnall presence: for if bread remaine after consecration, then there is no carnall presence, but bread remaineth after consecration, therefore there is no carnall presene. And because this verse sheweth to the world that there is bread after consecration, therefore you cut off the part of the verse, which is verie deceitfully done, And leaue this word *bread* out after consecration to blind the eies of the simple. And also you cut off the next words, to cover other two errors, the words be these *Or drinke the Challice of the Lord vnworthelie.* Out of which I note, first, that you keepe this backe, hoping thereby to establish your halfe communion vnder one kinde, that the Catholickes might thinke that the receiving of bread were sufficient, because (you saye) Christs bodie must needes even by the necessitie of *concomitancie* haue bloud in it, and therefore it is no need to receiue the cup: which if it be true, (but I am sure it is most false) then Christ was deceived in his wisedome, and the Apostles and primitiue Church in their practise, which I hope you dare not say for shame and shame. And therefor giue ouer these irreligious practises of Additions, Subtractions, Interpositions, and vaine expositions, with new Inkhorne-termes of

Concomitãcie sume what yonger then your Transubstantiation both forgetby your selues ne-

concomitancie,

...mitancie, and confesse Christ his a mcient and A-...licall trueth truelie.

Thus much to giue the Catholickes a taste of the ...gs you offer them, in lulling them a sleepe in the ...e of ignorance and superstition, whereas they ...ld be most willing and readie to obey the aun-...t, (a) powerfull, and everlasting Gospell of Iesus ...ist, if you did not mislead them by your wilfull ...ors, and keepe backe from them the reading of the ...ptures, which holds them and hardeneth them in ...cusancie. But take heed, least you by this ignorance ...which you keepe them, and the disobedience to the ...spell in which you fetter them, you with them and ...r them, hazard not that dolefull taste and torment ...pared for wilfull ignorant Recusants of Christ his ...spell, where it is said: *Rendring vengeance in fla-...ng fire to them that knovv not God, nor obey not the gos-...l of Iesus Christ.* Now Gentlemen, if you be authors ...their sinnes, you must be partakers of their punish-...ents: which both the Lord in mercie prevent. Now ...lloweth another part of your proofe drawen out of ...part of the 27. verse, in these words; *Shal be guiltie ...the bodie and bloud of Christ:*

Out of these words some late writers since your ...nsubstansiation was invented, would proone two ...ine questions that are in controversie betwixt you ...d vs.

1. The first, is your carnall presence of Christ in ...e Sacrament.

The second, that the wicked doe eate the bodie ...d drinke the bloud of Christ

In handling and aunswering these, I shall hardlie ...ever the one from the other, but as you inferre, that ...e graunting of the one confirmes the other: So must ...in confuting the one destroy the other, and so one ...unswere will serue to confute both.

Thus

...ver knovn in Christe Church for a 1000 yeares at leaste, And therfore they are to nevv to be Catholick & to strāg to be true.

(a) Reuel. 14. 6. Rom. 1. 16. 2. Thess: 1. 8.

The Text is the Lord, not Christ, the vvriter mistook it, the Author I blame not.

Rhem: Test: 1. Cor: 11: Vers 16.

Thus you record to the worlds wonder, (& Rome & Rhemes shame) against God, Christ, Scriptures, and Fathers, that ill livers and Infidels, eate the bodie and drinke the bloud of Christ in the Sacrament, and your reason there followeth: that they could not bee guiltie of that they received not, and that it could not bee so hainous an offence, for anie man to receiue a peece of bread or a cup of wine though they were a true Sacrament. First, old father *Origen* shall answere you,

Origen super Matth: 15, page 27.

who saith, *Est verus cibus quem nemo malus potest edere:* It is true meat which no wicked man can eate. Heere *Origen* condemneth the Rhemists, Romanists, and all late Priests and Iesuites, for holding this opinion iniurious to Christs death, and all true Catholickes faith.

But you may obiect against *Origen*, and say, the Rhemists laid downe their opinion, and gaue reasons to confirme it: But where is *Origens* reason by which he prooues his former position, that no wicked man can eate Christs bodie? forsooth it is in his Comentarie vpon your text. brought forth of *matthew* in these words: *Panis quem filius Dei corpus suum esse dixit, verbum est nutritorium animarum:* the bread which the son of God said to be his bodie, is the nourishing word of our soules.

Super Matth. 26.

Out of which this we gather, that seeing this bread or meate is the nourishment of our soules, & not of our bodies, he spake of the heavenlie part of the sacrament. For we know in common sence, that bread and wine cannot nourish the soule, but the bodie, & I haue proued by scriptures and Fathers before, that the hand and mouth of the soule, is a liuelie & iustifying faith, which you & all your side cannot denie but the wicked want. Now if the wicked haue no mouth nor stomacke to receiue this spirituall food, and digest it, as the forsaid Fathers haue affirmed, why doe you say, that the wicked and Infidels can eate the bodie of Christ, wanting

both

both hands, mouth, and stomacke?

And the scriptures call wicked men dead men: Now you knowe dead men cannot eate meate corporall, no more can the wicked which are dead spirituallie, eate meat cælestiall. And *Chrysostome* saith, Let no *Iudas* stand to, no covetous person, if anie be a disciple, let him be present, for this Table receiues no such as *Iudas* or *Magus*, for Christ saith, I keepe my Passover with my disciples. *Chrysost. Hom. 60. ad pop. Antioch.*

And to conclude with *Augustine, Tract. 26. super Ioh. pag. 175. Qui non manet in Christo & in quo non manet Christus procul dubio, &c.* Hee that abides not in Christ, and in whom Christ abides not, out of doubt eateth not spirituallie his flesh, nor drinketh his bloud, although carnallie and visiblie he presse with his teeth the Sacrament of the bodie and bloud of Christ, but rather eateth and drinketh the Sacrament of so great a thing to his iudgement, & the reason followeth, *Quia immundus, &c.* because hee is vncleane in heart, and presumes to come to the Sacrament of Christ, which no man can worthilie receiue, vnlesse he be pure and cleane in heart: as Christ saith, *Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.* *Math. 5.*

Out of *Augustine* I obserue against both your opinions these things:

First, hee makes a difference of Christes flesh, and the Sacrament of Christes flesh, for they bee two things, and to be distinguished with their severall substances and properties, and not to bee confounded or transubstantiated one into the other, and so the nature of bread perish, as you vntruelie imagine and teach.

Secondlie, that the wicked receiue and grinde with their teeth and swallow with their throat the outward Sacrament, that is, the outward visible creatures of bread and wine, to their iudgement or condemnation,

Rheme Test: 1. Cor: 11. Sect: 16.

Thus you record to the worlds wo[illegible] & Rhemes shame) against God, Christ, [illegible] Fathers, that ill livers and Infidels, [illegible] drinke the bloud of Christ in the Sac[illegible] reason there followeth: that they could [illegible] of that they received not, and that it [illegible] hainous an offence, for anie man to [illegible] of bread or a cup of wine though they [illegible] Sacrament. First, old father *Origen* [illegible] who saith, *Est verus cibus quem* [illegible] It is true meat which no wicked man [illegible] *Origen* condemneth the Rhemists, R[illegible] late Priests and Iesuites, for holding this [illegible] rious to Christs death, and all true Cath[illegible]

Origen super Math: 15. page 27.

But you may object against *Origen*, [illegible] Rhemists laid downe their opinion, and [illegible] to confirme it: But where is *Origen* [illegible] he prooues his former position, that [illegible] can eate Christs bodie? forsooth it is in his [illegible] rie vpon your text, brought forth of [illegible] words: *Panis quem filius Dei corpus* [illegible] *bum est nutritorium animarum*: the [illegible] of God said to be his bodie, is the [illegible] our soules.

Super Math: 26.

Out of which this we gather, that [illegible] or meate is the nourishment of our soules [illegible] bodies, he spake of the hexaculie part of [illegible] For we know in common sense, that [illegible] cannot nourish the soule, [illegible] ved by scriptures and Fathers [illegible] mouth of the soule, is a liuelie [illegible] you & all your side cannot deni[illegible] Now if the wicked haue no mouth [illegible] ceiue this spiritual food, and digest [illegible] Fathers haue affirmed, why doe you [illegible] ked and Infidels can eate the bodie of C[illegible]

Acts. 15 9 because they presume to come without a cleane heart and conscience purified by faith. But the godly eat the heavenlie part of the Sacrament: which is Christ with his benefits, because they dwel in Christ (by faith) and Chrih in them (by his spirit) as hath been plainelie handled before.

Part. 3. distinct. 2. cap. 65. And now I will be bolde to vrge your owne Popes decrees against you: *Qui discordat a Christo &c.* whosoever dissenteth from Christ, doeth neither eate his flesh nor drinke his bloud, but the wicked dissent from Christ, therfore they neither eat Christs flesh nor drinke his bloud. And cap. 69. following, *quicunque panem, &c.* Whosoever eateth this bread the Lord, shall liue for ever, but the wicked liue not for ever, therefore the wicked eate not this bread the Lord.

Now Gentlemen, I would faine see how you can disproue these Fathers and old Popes, and satisfie the Catholicks in this case: but I shall haue a fit place to speak of the vnreasonablenesse of this opinion in the title of the Masse, where I must shewe to the Catholickes, the Popes, Priests, and Iesuits shamefull opinions, that you thinke it no inconvenience not onelie for the wicked, but also for all such bruit beasts, as cats or dogs, rats or mice, hogs or swine, to eate the blessed bodie, and drinke the precious bloud of Iesus Christ: This you blush not to print, but I protest, my hand shakes and my heart quakes to write it, because it is so monstrous and beastlie a blasphemie to that blessed bodie & that precious bloud, that suffered and was shed for my salvation.

Chrysost. Tom. 3. Hom. 60. & 61. de Iumentis. Now for this second part of your Rhemish note vpon this place, which is, *How can a man bee guiltie of Christs bodie, if he touch not Christs bodie?* I had rather *Chrisostome* vpon this text in one of his workes should aunswere you then I, his words be these: *Nam si hegiam contaminantes purpuram, similiter puniuntur, sicut, &c.*

For

For if he that hath disteined, violated, or polluted the kings robes, whether it bee of purple or some other matter, shall be as severelie in iustice punished, as if he had rent thē: Even so it shall be with such as receiue the Lords bodie *impura mente*, with an vnprepared and vnclean mind, they shall be punished with equall torments with such as nailed him to the crosse.

bus indigne divina & sancta mysteria præcipue de cœna Domini & de baptismate.

Out of which I obserue, first, that *Chrysostome* condemneth your carnall presence and corporall eating, in telling you they must be eaten with the mind, not with the mouth: but of this we haue sufficientlie spoken of before.

Secondlie, by comparison, he sheweth you how you may bee guiltie of treason against the kings person (though he neither touch nor hurt his person) in offering disgrace but to his garments, his person being absent. And as he that contumeliously receiveth the princes seale (though of waxe) is guiltie of the Maiestie of the Prince, not which he receiueth, but which hee despiseth: so he that eateth this bread, and drinketh this cup of the Lord without due preparation (as aforesaid) considering they are seales of Christs promised benefits, purchased in his bitter and blessed passion, committeth high treason against Christ: though in deed in substance they receiue but bread and wine. And as a man may be guiltie of treason in renting, defacing, or clipping the kings picture, seale, or coine, though the king be not locallie in place: so the wicked in the Sacraments which are Christs seales, which being abused by them, they are guiltie of Gods iudgements, though Christ be not inclosed locallie in the bread & wine.

And what *Chrysostome* speaketh heare of the Lords Supper, the same hee doth of Baptisme, and saith, a man may be as well guiltie of the Lords bodie and bloud in contemning Baptisme, which is but a seale of his washing in the bloud of Christ, though hee never

washed but in water, and alleadgeth *Paul*, *Heb.* 10. 29. saying, Of how much sorer punishment suppose yee shal he be worthy which treadeth vnder foot the sonne of God, & counteth the bloud of the testamẽt as an vnholie thing, &c. These Fathers haue aunswered you, and I hope will satisfie fullie the indifferent Reader.

Now three sorts of men are guilty of the body and bloud of the Lord. The first are plaine *Atheists*, that are without God or godlinesse in this present world, and such eate this bread vnworthelie, and therefore are guiltie of Christes bodie and bloud.

Three sorts of men guilty of the Lo: bodie.

2 The second sort haue a historicall faith, and a generall knowledge, and beleeue that whatsoeuer is taught in Gods booke is true, but they lacke apprehension and application to make a particular and holy vse of the same, and therefore if such come and eate of this bread, they are guiltie of the bodie and bloud of the Lord.

3 The third sort haue a liuelie apprehending & applying faith, yet in their life they slippe and fall, yea sometimes verie grieuouslie, yet they awake & weep with *Peter*, and repent for the same. All these are said to eate vnworthelie, but the first two sorts vnto their condemnation.

The third sort for their faults, frailties, negligences, and vndue preparation, are in this life of the Lord corrected, least with the world they should be damned. The two first sorts eateth onelie the outward elements: the last sort eateth the bodie of Christ and drinketh the bloud of Christ. And now to your second proofe out of Saint *Paul*.

1. Cor. 10. 16. *The chalice of benediction which wee bleſſe, is it not the communication of the bodie of Christ? And the bread which wee breſſe, is it not the participation of his fleſh?*

Catho. Prieſtes.

GEntlemen, yee wrong the Apoſtles text: firſt in your abuſe of words, ſecondlie in miſtaking the ſence. Your words be theſe, *The chalice of benediction: Pauls* words in Greeke that muſt be iudge betwixt vs, and which wee doe follow (if we will follow Christ) are theſe. *The cup of thanſgiving.* And the holie Ghoſt ſo expounds his owne meaning after, calling it *poculum Domini*, the cup of the Lord. But you are much to be blamed of all good men, becauſe you had rather follow ſome late corrupt tranſlation, & vſe ſome ſuperſtitious Inkhorne-termes lately deviſed, and ſo forſake the olde Apoſtolical phraſe which the holie Ghoſt vſeth in that holie tongue, and in which it is ſtill recorded for our inſtruction: either confeſſe your ignorance in the Greeke, or your malice againſt the trueth, that the Catholickes bee no longer ſeduced by you, that long truſted in you and to your doctrine.

Rider. verſe. 21.

Againe, you ſay, *The bread which wee bleſſe*, we ſay as *Paul* ſaid, and the holie Ghoſt pend, *The bread which wee breake*: Alaſſe, alaſſe, what ſinne doe you commit in thus ſeducing Chriſts flocke, and the Queens ſubiects, who hitherto haue builded their faith vppon your bare words.

Is this plaine dealing with Gods heritage? are you Catholicke Prieſtes? I pray you certifie the Catholickes what tongue or tranſlation hath it thus as you pen it, *The bread which wee bleſſe*: I tell you plainelie, (yet in charitie) that you doe belie the Texte,

falsifie the tongue, and seeke to keepe the people in blinde ignorance, and superstitious palpable darkenes, to their everlasting condemnation, vnlesse the Lord recall them, and they repent them. *Pauls* wordes are these in Greeke, and so your owne *Ieromes* translation hath them: *The bread which vve breake.* But you are so besotted with the crossing of your fingers, which you tell the simple people is the true Catholicke blessing, that you forget and forgoe the true blessing of the cup, which is the Apostolicall thanksgiving to God for our redemption purchased in Christs bloud, whereof the cup is the true signe.

Againe, we say as the holy Ghost indited it, and *Paul* writ it, *The communion of the bodie of Christ*: you say as no learned man or the Greeke text ever said, *the participation of his flesh.* Thus much I haue shewed how vntrulie you deale: First, in abusing the words of the Apostle: secondlie, in seducing and deceiving the Catholickes. Let heere the charitable Catholickes iudge how you will abuse their eares with fables, that dare thus falsifie the plaine text.

Error in the sense of the Texte.

Now I come to shew how you mistake the sence of the words in the text, seeking by indirect wresting to make the text proone your errour, which it denieth in flat termes and trueth. For I assure the Catholickes, that not one word, syllable, letter, or title of this text once sounds of your carnall presence.

Rhem. Testament. 1. cor. 10. fol. 4.

You follow the Rhemist, who in this place thus expounds the words of the Apostle, *The cup which vve blesse*, that is to say, *the challice of consecration vvhich vve Apostles & priests by Christs commission do consecrate, &c.* and afterwards it followeth, the Apostle expressly referreth the *benediction* to the Challice, and not to God, making the holie bodie and the communicating thereof the effect of the *benediction.* Now let mee intreate you to auouch me and the Catholickes, but these

necessarie

neceſſarie queſtions drawne out of this your owne opinion.

1. Firſt, by what ſcripture do you proue that you are Apoſtles?

2 Secondlie, by what ſcripture doe you proue that you are Prieſts?

3 Thirdlie, by what ſcripture doe you proue your commiſſion to conſecrate Challices?

4 Fourthly, by what ſcripture doe you proue, that the holie bloud of Chriſt is an effect of your *benediction* of the cup?

5 Laſtlie, by what ſcripture proue you that this bleſſing or thankſgiving is referred to the Challice and not to God?

Vnleſſe you proue theſe points by canonicall ſcriptures to be true, (which you ſhall never doe) they bind no mans conſcience to beleeue them or you. Againſt the firſt I thus obiect, that you are no Apoſtles, & thus I proue it. A true Apoſtle muſt be called by Chriſt immediatlie, and that you are not. He muſt ſee the Lord Ieſus in the fleſh, which you haue not. Hee muſt haue his immediat commiſſion from Chriſt to preach everie where, which neither Prieſt, Seminarie, Ieſuit, Cardinall, nor Pope can haue, as your owne conſciences full well doth knowe, and therefore you are not Chriſts Apoſtles. The true Apoſtles were equall in authoritie, you diſdaine it, nay more, you haue made againſt this, a new article of the Popes ſupremacie, and whole volumes of Cardinals Primacies, Ieſuits Excellencies, & Prieſts Soveraignties.

Apoſtles ye are not. Gal. 1. 1. 1. Cor. 9. 1. 2. Act. 9: 15. Rom. 1. 1. Gal 2. Ephes. 2.

But I will ſay to you, as *Tertullian* ſaide to *Marcion* the hereticke: If you bee Prophets, foretell vs ſome things to come: if that you be Apoſtles, preach every where, and agree with the Apoſtles in doctrine. For whoſoever preach not the ſame doctrine the Apoſtles did, haue not the ſame commiſſion the Apoſtles had.

Tertulian contra. Marcion.

Bug

Iesuits & Priests be no Apostles.

But you late Priests and Iesuits preach not the same doctrine the Apostles did: therefore you haue not the same commission the Apostles had. The maior hath no difficultie: the minor is so plaine it needs no proofe: the conclusion is inevitable.

Priests ye are not.

We read of foure kinds of Priests in Gods Booke: three of them in the old Testament, and one in the new. The first after the order of *Aaron*: and one other after the order of *Melchisedech*: and the third after the order of *Baall*. After *Aarons* order you wil not be: And after *Melchisedechs* you cannot be: And concerning the third order, I would you were as free from the ydolatrie of that false order, as you would be free of the imputation of their heresies.

First, Because yee will not offer the flesh of beasts.

Secondly, none after Melchisedechs order but Christ onely.

Now (a) Saint *Peter* in the new Testament setteth downe a fourth order of Priests, which is a kinglie or royall Priesthood, but that is spirituall, not carnall, inward, not outward, common to all beleevers, not proper (as you imagine) to anie naturall order, or ecclesiasticall function. For this is sound divinitie, which you shall never disprooue: that the office of sacrificers and sacrificing, is either singular to Christ, in respect of his sacrifice propitiatorie onelie vppon the crosse: or else common to all true Christians, in respect of their spirituall sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving: neither shall you ever finde this word *Sacerdos*, ever applied in the new Testament to any Ecclesiasticall order and function of men. And therefore you deceiue the people by this name of Priest which is no more proper to you, then to everie beleeving Christian. But it is likely you will giue me occasion to speake of this in the controversie of your Masse, and therefore I will heere be the briefe in this place.

(a) 1. Pet. 2 9. Exod. 19. 6.

The name & office of Priests, abused by Priests.

Thirdlie, in what place of scripture did Christ giue you commission to consecrate challices, or to make

one chalice more holie by your charmed consecration, then Christs cup was in his blessed institution, which had none of your consecration, for this the Catholicks must know by the premisses formerly hadled, that your consecration is not like to Christs consecration: for either Christs blessing or thanksgiving, with the whole action of Christ in the institution, was sufficient to consecrate or insufficient: if you will affoord Christ that favor that it was sufficient, then yours is frivolous.

And whereas we vse the same sanctification Christ did, how dare you say ours is defective, without blasphemie to Christes institution? But this your vsurped title of sanctitie which yee attribute to your selues, in making the people beleeue that you can make one cup (water salte, or season) more holie then an other, by your fingred blessing: is vntrue and a pharisaicall brag. This maintaineth your Priesthoode in glorie, pompe, and worldlie estimation, but hath brought many of seelie Catholickes to beggerie, ignorance, and grosse superstition.

Fourthlie, by what scripture can you proove that Christs holie bloud is but an effect of your consecration, or *benediction* of the cup? If Christs bloud bee an effect of your cup *benediction*, then your cup *benediction* is the cause of Christs holie bloud. O hellish and damnable diuinities: as if a sinfull ignorant Priest could by his magicall consecration, make the holie bloud of Christ my Saviour, which was shed on the crosse for my sinnes. Now Catholicks looke to your selues, I meane to your soules: for this is the doctrine of Rome and Rhemes, fitter to be taught in hell by fiendes, then maintained in earth by Priests. Fifthlie and lastlie, by what scripture do you proove, (nay by what auncient Father) that this blessing or thanksgiving is referred to the cup or chalice, and not vnto God: scriptures you

You cannot proove either by scripture or fathers.

haue none, and fathers of the first sixe hundred years never heard of it. And that the Catholickes may see the antiquitie and veritie of this our doctrine, and the noveltie and heresie of yours, I will onelie produce but two learned Fathers with vs against you, & forbeare to alleadge the rest, till you giue mee further occasion.

Chrys. super 1 Cor. 10.

Chrysostome vpon this place, calleth it the cuppe of blessing, because when we haue it in our hands, with admiration and a certaine horror of that vnspeakable gift, we praise and blesse him, because he hath shed his bloud, that we should not remaine in errors and hath not onelie shed it, but made vs all partakers of it. In like sort did *Photius* and *Oecumenius* expounde this word, *which vvee blesse*, which having in our handes, blesse him, which hath graciously given vs his bloud: that is, we giue him thanks, or which we prepare when we blesse or giue thankes.

Photius & Oecumenius.

Now the Catholickes may see by the auncient fathers (whom your selues doe brag of) that they condemne your cup blessed exposition. And the Catholickes may see as in a glasse, that wee ioine with the scriptures and fathers in the true sence of these words: *The cup vvhich vve blesse*: and that your exposition is erronious and superstitious, and therefore to be recanted by you, and shunned by the Catholickes, and my reasons be drawne out of the foresaid fathers, not made on my owne fingers.

1 First, he saith that *benediction*, blessing, or thanksgiving, is referred to him that shed his bloud for vs: I hope you will not say the cup shed anie bloud for vs.

2 Secondlie, this father saith, that blessing God and praising God is all one: and therefore when we say, the cup of thanksgiving, we follow Christ, *Paul*, the Greek text, and the olde fathers. And when you translate it, *The challice of benediction*, it is flat contrarie to Christ, *Paul*,

Paul, veritie, and antiquitie. And there is as great difference betwixt your opinion and the old fathers faith, as betwixt praising with mouth, and crossing with fingers; nay, as much as betwixt your superstitious chalice and our soule-saving Christ: for so, if you marke the fathers words, the difference stands.

The text it selfe offers vs three things in a comfortable distinction, and you would confound them with your new imagined transubstansiation.

1 The first is Christs bodie crucified, and his bloud shed, with all his purchased benefits,

2 Secondlie, our communion & fellowship, which all beleevers haue in that crucified Christ, and those soulesaving merits.

3 Thirdly, the outward seals of those benefits which are called, *the cup vvhich vve blesse*, and *the bread which vve breake* to witnesse to the world, and to confirme to our selues, the fruition and possession of all those benefits.

Now if I should say, that the bread & cup being outward seals, were our cōmunion with Christ; the wicked would laugh at my folly, though the godly would pittie my ignorance in the trueth, or my malice against the trueth: and the reason is this, beeause the seal be things outward, and the communion of Christs bodie and bloud, be things inward: the one sensible, the other spirituall and intellectuall: & as much difference is betwixt them, as there is betwixt outward and inward: sensible, and intellectuall; so much difference there is betwixt the outward seals of Christs body and bloud, and his bodie and bloud.

And if the seales cannot be changed into the communion of Christs bodie and bloud, but remaine still in their severall natures and substances, everie one performing his severall distinct office, much lesse can they be reallie and substantiallie changed into Christs bodie

and bloud, which are things more remote, but most impossible. And if you had added the next verse the Apostle had made it plaine in shewing you a double communion sealed in this Sacrament. The first, our communion with Christ and his benefits. The second, our communion a mongst our selues, which both are proper *onely* to gods church, & to *euery one* of gods church, and all *waies* to gods Church.

1. *Soli.*
2. Omni.
3. *Semper.*

Now let the learned Iudge whether you or we, misconster scripture, wrest fathers, deceaue Christs flocke and the Queenes subiects & peruerte the true meaning of this *Text*. And now to the next.

Catholicke Priests.

The second Proofe by Councells and Fathers.

This councell consists of .318. fathers.

Concilium Nicen: cap: 14. Anno: 363. No rule or custome doth permitte, that they which haue not the authority to offer the sacrifice, should giue it to them that offer the bodie of Christe.

Rider.

GEntelmē you are possessed with a threefold error which is the cause whē you read the scripture, Councells, & fathers, you misunderstand thē. your first error is, whē you vnderstand that spoken of the outward Elements, which is meant of the inward inuisible grace. Your second error is whē you referre that to the visible partes of the bodie, which they intended to the inuisible powers of the minde and soule. Thirdlie, your former two errors beget a third eror which is your mistaking the state of our questiō: And so wheras you should proue the maner of Christs presence in the Sacraments: you offer to proue the matter but of that we haue spoken before.

with these three Sophisticall points you peruert all the fathers you bring for this purpose & deceue the Catholickes.

Thus if you will reade the scripturs, fatheres & Councells with these .3. cautions or derectiōs, you shall easily see how farre thus longe you haue gone from the truth

and

and misled the Queenes subiects.

Now with Gods permission wee will proceed to the examination of your proofe, as it is alledged out of your owne Colen print, *Ex officina Iohannis Quintell Typographi, Anno Domini*, 1561. which you cannot denie, it is in the first Tome and the fourteenth Chapter, and the two hundreth fiftie fiue page of the first edition, and the Chapter beginnes thus: *Peruenit ad sanctum Concilium quod in locis quibusdam & ciuitatibus presbyteris Sacramenta Diaconi porrigant.* Then followes your fraction (verie abruptlie) in the midst of a sentence: *Hoc neque regula neque consuetudo, &c.*

The sacred Councell is aduertized, that in certaine places and Cities the Deacons doe reach and giue the sacraments to the Priests (al this you leaue out, and then followes your weake warrant) Noe rule or custome doth permite &c.

I praie you what one word of this prooues your Carnall presence? Let me knowe it for my learning and the Catholickes better Instruction: if you would gather out of this word Sacrifice: then you are deceued, for that Councell in another place calles it *Sacrificium Eucharisticum* a Sacrifice of praise & thanksgiuing, not propitiatorie.

And if out of these wordes *The bodie of Christ*: the councell expounds their meaning in that which you omitte, and purposely conceale, when they call that *Sacrifice*, and *the bodie of Christ* by the name of *Sacraments* giuen by the *Deacons* to the priests: for the Deacons deliuered them after Consecration to the priestes and still were *Sacramenta, Sacraments*, not the bodie or bloud of Christ made of bread & wine by the Priest: for the Sacrament and Christs bodie differ as much, as the lambe & the Passover, circumcisiō & the couenant, the washing of new birth & regeneratiō, for the one is the outward seal, the other the inward grace, and

and here is another error of yours of the second and third kinde, in referring that to the mouth which is proper to our faith; and still mistaking the matter for the manner.

Catho. Priests. *Concilium Ephesinum in Epist. ad Nestorium: We approache to the mysticall benedictions, and we are sanctified, being partakers of the holie bodie and precious bloud of Christ.*

And this had 200. Fathers.

THis your proofe is truelie quoted, *pag.* 535. & the Epistle beginneth thus, *Religioso & Deo amabili consacerdoti Nestorio, Cyrillus, &c.* The Councell calleth it a mysticall benediction, no miraculous transubstantiation. And this neither prooues your opinion, nor disprooues ours: for you say, yee are made partakers of the holie bodie and precious bloud of Christ, and so say we: but you say with the late church of Rome, that you are made partakers of that holie bodie and precious bloud, by your mouth, teeth, throat, and stomacke; And we say with Scriptures, fathers, and the old Church of Rome, that we are made partakers of Christs bodie and bloud, by the hand, mouth, and stomack of our soules, which is a liuelie faith in Christ crucified; as you haue heard before. And thus you referre that to the visible parts of the bodie (as your mouth, teeth, and stomacke) which the scriptures and fathers meant of the invisible powers of the soule, as our liuelie faith, being the spirituall hand, mouth, and stomacke thereof. And heere is your errour of the second kinde. And so your two testimonies out of these two Councels, are proofes neither proper nor pertinent, brought onelie to dazell the eies of the simple, and to comfort the minds of the weake. But I referre the the badnesse of your cause, and the weaknesse of your proofes, (nay your disproofes) to the censure of the indifferent Reader. Onelie giving the Reader this note

Reader.

by the

by the way, that these Councels were called by the Emperour, not by the Pope, nay the Pope was not president in these Councels, but other Bishops chosen by the Emperour. And in the Councell of *Nice* the Popes Legat had but the fourth roome, no better account was made of him. For in deed he then was no Pope but an Archbishop. Thus the Reader may see that these Councels be against you. And now to your testimonies out of the fathers.

The flesh is fed by the bodie and bloud of Christ, that the soule might be fat in God.

Catholick Priests, Tertullian de resurrectione carnis, floruit 200. Rider.

OVt of this, thus you frame an argument (as sometimes an old Romane friend of yours did,) to maintaine your carnall presence. The soule is fed by that which the bodie eateth, but the soule is fed by the flesh of Christ, therefore the bodie eateth the flesh of Christ in the Sacrament.

I might as fitlie invert this argument vpon you, as a learned man of our side once inverted it, saying, As the soule feeds vpon Christ, so doth the bodie: but the soule is fed by faith, therefore the bodie is fed by faith, which is verie absurd and improper, yet as pertinent and as proper as yours.

And heere you should remember the olde distinction of the fathers spoken of before. The Sacrament is one thing, and the matter of the sacrament is another thing. Outwardlie the bodie eateth the sacrament, and inwardly the soule by faith feeds on the body of Christ. As in Baptisme the flesh is washed by water (as that old father saith in that place) that the soule may be purged spiritualliet so our bodies eate the outward Sacrament, that the soule may be fed of God. Againe, it is not generallie true, that whatsoever the bodie eateth, the soule is fed by the same. And if you would propound

pound but particularlie this instance of eating onelie in the Sacrament, then the argument proveth nothing standing vpon meere perticulers.

Moreouer, the bodie and soule are fed by the same meat in the sacrament, but not after the same manner. For the bodie is nourished by the naturall properties of the Elements which they haue to nourish; But the soule by the sacramentall and supernaturall power, as they are signes and seales of heavenlie graces. And we graunt that the soule is fed by the precious bodie and bloud of Christ, but not after a carnall maner, as you say, but spiritualrie by faith.

Againe, a mean Scholler in Gods booke, may see this phrase is figuratiue, and therefore the sence spirituall. For how can a soule be fat in God? will yee say it is a corporall fatnesse, such as is proper to bodies? I thinke yee will not, I know you should not then this place is impertinentlie brought, neither savoring of sence, nor suteable to that you alleadge it. For if you would haue read the same Father in the same booke following, he would haue told you so, for (saith he) the word which was made flesh (which is Christ) *Devorandus est auditu, ruminandus intellectu, & fide digerendus.* This word Christ must be swallowed vhole by hearing, must be meditated vpon or remembred by vnderstanding, & digested by faith. Now you see *Tertullian* of your owne *Paris* print aunsweres you, & expounds himselfe. And seeing no man can better expound *Tertullian* his meaning then *Tertullian* himselfe therefore haue I brought him from your owne Catholicke Presse of *Paris*, to condemne all Iesuits and Priests that shall set a litterall sence vppon an allegorical phrase, onelie to deceiue the simple plaine Catholicks, and to abuse the godlie learned Fathers, by an ignorant and foolish construction. And now to the rest of your prooses that follow.

page: 47. printed at paris: 1580.

[illegible] hath left vs his flesh to eate, and his bloud to drinke, that we might be nourished by that, by vvhich vve haue been redeemed.

Catholicks Priestes.

Cyprian de Duplici Marti floruit: 249.

Rider.

A Blinde man may see that you never read this in *Cyprian* your selfe, or else that you vnderstand them not. For *Cyprian* saith not, God hath left vs his flesh; but *Reliquit nobis edendam carnem suam, reliquit bibendum sanguinem, &c.* he hath left vs his flesh to eate, and his bloud to drinke. I pray you pardon me to aske you which is the nominatiue case to the verbe, is *Deus*? no, but if you had begunne seven lines sooner, as you ought in deed to haue done, at *Nemo maiorem charitatem habet, &c.* you should haue found the right nominatiue case, that there might haue been not onelie a grammaticall concord, but also a Theologicall harmonie, and then the sence had bene plaine. For it was hee that died for his enemies, that left vs his flesh, &c. And that was Christ, not God the father. But you begunne (after your accustomed manner) in the middest of a sentence, mistaking the nominatiue case to the verbe; and so lay downe heresie for divinitie: for God the father hath neither flesh nor blould. But if I should helpe you with a charitable construction, by attributing that to Christes Deitie, which is proper to his humanitie, yet you still haue wrested the father and abused the Reader.

But thus *Cyprian* is to be read: Christ hath left vs his flesh to eate and his bloud to drinke: so we confesse it, we beleeue it, and we teach it: but to be eaten and drunke spirituallie by faith, not corporallie, nor gutturallie, as you imagine. For this is the inward invisible Grace of the Sacramente that you propound.

Now how this flesh and bloud of Christ is to be eaten, or how Christs flesh and bloud are naturallie, substantiallie, & reallie vnder the formes of bread and wine, which is our question, you cannot prooue by Cyprian: and so still you propound the matter to vs when you should prooue the maner to vs: and here is your error in the third kinde, (if not in moe) before specified.

Cyprian de Cana Domini nu. 9.

And heere you bring a testimonie out of Cyprian where hee speaketh not properlie of the sacrament but of the threefold Martyrdome, which hee gathered out of the death of Christ; and therefore you shew a great weaknesse in running to that Tractate, whereas you might haue spedde better (if you had list) neere home. For if you had reade or woulde reade that Father vpon his Treatise of the Lords Supper, hee would haue either changed your minde, or hardned your heart, but howsoever, discoverd your errors.

What it is to eate Christes flesh and drinke Christs bloud.

And that the eating of Christs flesh and drinking of Christs bloud, is not a grosse corporall swallowing of his blessed flesh and precious bloud, as you deeme; but that *Esus carnis Christi, est quadam auiditas, & quoddam desyderium manendi in ipso, &c.* The eating of Christs flesh is a certaine egernesse and a certaine desire to abide in Christ, &c. And three lines before this he saith, *Our abiding in him is our eating of him*; and *the drinke is a certaine incorporation into him.*

How Christ must bee eaten.

And in the latter end of the Treatise, you shall finde that Father touch the point in question betwix vs: *hae quotiens agimus, non dentes ad mordendum acuimus, sed fide syncera panem sanctum frangimus & partimus, &c.* As often as we receiue these holie mysteries, we whet not our teeth to bite or chew, but breake and divide this holie bread by a sincere faith, &c. And foure lines before that (saith he) *Edulium carnis Christi defecatis animis, &c.* The food of Christs flesh must be eaten with

purified

...ified minds, saith not with washed mouthes. And ...tle before that, hee saith, the wicked *lambunt po-...m, &c.* licke the rocke, but neither sucke honie nor ...le, &c. that is to say, they eate the Sacrament, but ...t the inward grace of the Sacrament. Thus I hope ...e indifferent Reader is satisfied that your proofe is ...t pertinent to the matter in question, and therefore ...weth the weaknesse of your cause, and the wilful-...sse of your mindes, that will seeke so stiflie to main-...ne fables with wresting fathers: for *Cyprians* place ...t you bring, handleth the invisible grace of the Sa-...ment. And in this place which I bring, he toucheth ...e manner how that grace is to be received, that is, ...th faith as we say, not teeth as you teach, &c. And ...*Cyprian* agrees with himselfe, and we with *Cyprian* ...yne against your carnall opinion. And thus having ...swered *Cyprian* with *Cyprian*, and shewed you your ...ersight and mistaking of *Cyprian*, I will come to ...e examination of your next proofe.

Impij nec se iudicant nec sacramenta diiudicant. ibid. n. 13.

Transubstantiation is but in deede a fable.

...re is no doubt left of the veritie of the flesh and bloud of Christ, for now by the assurance of our Lord, and certaintie of our faith, it is his true flesh and his true bloud.

Catholic Priests.

Hyllarius de Trinitate lib. 4. & 8. floruit: 370. Rider.

GEntlemen: now we must needs commend you, for you giue testimonie with the truth and vs, against the late church of Rome & your selues, ...w you come neere the quicke in deed, and therefore ...eake both the trueth, and truhe. This is the manner ...w Christ must be eaten, by faith, but you should ...e added the next line following, *Et hae accepta at-...e exhausta id efficiunt &c.* and these, (that is, sancti-...d bread, and wine) being thus by *faith* taken & thus ...nke, bring this to passe, that Christ is in vs, and we ...Christ: so now you say with *Hyllario*, that Christ

dwelleth in all them that receiue him by faith. And so by this your owne warrant you witnesse to the world, that there is no place for the corporall receiuing of Christ by the wicked, (as Rome teacheth it) because Christ dwelleth not in them, nor they in him. And so because this your proofe prooues one part of the matter in question against your selues, that Christ is to bee eaten or receiued by our faith, not by our mouth or teeth, I will addresse my selfe to the examination of your next proofe.

Your owne proofe is one our side.

Nothing remaineth in the worlde of the bodie and bloud of Christ, but that which dayly is made by the Priest on the Altar.

Catholicke Priestes. Alban: lib. de Passione Imaginis Christi cap. 7. florwit: 375. Rider.

GEntlemen: I perceiue you are soone wearie of well doing: in your last proofe you confessed a trueth with vs, euen against your selues: But now you leaue fathers and bring fables, and so produce one fable to prooue another fable: that is, you produce one fable of the crucifying of the image of Christ, and the miraculous abounding gushing of water and bloud out of the image his side, that cured all diseases in all parts and places of the world, to prooue your carnall presence of the Sacrament, by your fained transubstantiation.

Like opinion, like proofe.

When fathers helpe not, you bring fables.

For answere to which, first I say, that you should fitter haue placed this proofe in the ranke of your fained miracles following, or in your question of images hereafter. But to cover the foolerie and forgerie thereof, you couch it amongst the auncient Doctors and Fathers of the Church, thereby hoping to haue him passe with more credit. But I will shew first, that you haue not dealt well nor trulie with the Author of this fable, nor with the Catholickes of this kingdome, because you haue left out such words as would

ould wound both your credit in this case, and spoile your cause: besides, your Translation is nothing sound.

You leaue out in your two lines these foure words, *quasi per manus*, and *spiritualiter*: you left out *quasi* because belike it was but an Adverb of likenesse, and in because *omne simile* is not *idem*, you thought it were better to leaue it behinde, then to bring it to your hurt. Secondlie, you leaue out *per manus*, for your Authour saith, *per manus sacerdotum*, by the handes of the Priestes, and you leaue them both out, and say, *per sacerdotem*, least the people should thinke and say, if onelie the Priest made it, then it can neither haue flesh nor bloud, and so the miracle were marred.

And therfore it were better to leaue out *per manus*, & to say *per sacerdotem*, by the Priest, for then might be understood, not onelie all the members of his bodie, and intentions of his minde, but also all the gestures and motions of both, required to the conception of such a wodden Saviour.

And lastlie, you leaue out *spiritualiter*, spiritualle, hee saith not carnallie, and therefore this proofe is verie vnschollerlike alleadged: when our question is of a presence carnall, you produce a presence spirituall: this word makes for vs, but that wee scorne (and knowe it sinfull) to bring in such forgerie (for proofe) in a question of divinitie. For this you shoulde haue brought in thus, *vvbich is dailie made by the Priest spirituallie*. Now how this proofe fitteth you, let others censure; shame makes mee scilent.

This fable containeth seven chapters of the crucifying of the image of CHRIST done by the Iewes for envie to CHRIST: who no sooner pierced the Image his side, but *Continuo exiuit*

The word is Hydria, which you may see Iohn. 2. verse. 6. containes two or three measures or firkines a peece, which shewesit to be a notable loud lie, & lewd legend.

sanguis & aqua, forthwith gushed out both water and bloud in such aboundance, that they filled manie vessels with the same, and this bloud was carried into all the parts of the world, through *Asia*, *Affricke*, & *Europe*, and cured all manner of diseases. Vpon sight of which miracle the cruell Iewes repented, & were baptised: and presentlie there was a holie (a) day made in rememberanee thereof, which was kept with no lesse solemnitie then the feast of Easter, and the Nativitie of our Lord, as the Author saith. Then in the seventh and last chapter comes in your proofe, which concludeth a peace amongst the Clergie, touching the trueth of Christs bloud: for now saith the Author, *there can no other flesh nor bloud of Christ be found in the world, then that which is daylie made by the hands of the Priests spirituallie vpon the Altar.* But this your proofe is not truelie translated according to the Latten, but because it is a loude lie, I will neither reprooue you for your defectiue translation, nor correct it for anie mans direction; for I see no reason to bestow a true translation, vpon a false miracle or forged fable. Other circumstances, as, where this image was laide to bee kept and brought foorth, &c. I referre the curious Reader, to the foolish & forged Author. But that all the Catholicks of this kingdome may see the reasons that moove me to think it to be a fable, be these: all of them gathered out of the bodie of this fable, falselie fathered vpon *Athanasius*.

(a) *Quinto Idus Novemb.*

(b) *Like Translation like truth.*

1. *Reason.*

So severall places & persons falsly challeng to themselues that every one hath a proper

The first reason, is the occasion: for no small error sprung vp in those daies touching the bloud that issued forth of Christs side on the crosse: one sort of Priests said, that they had the right bloud, and another sort of Priests in other cities said, that they had Christs verie bloud that issued forth of his side: and so the contenon among the Priests grew to bee verie hote (as it is this day betwixt you Iesuits and Priestes about other

matters)

...ters) wherevpon the whole Cleargie met togither ...Cæsaria in Cappadocia, for the appeasing of this dan- ...rous broile. The reverend Fathers were no sooner ..., but vpstart *Don Petrus Bishop* of *Nicomedia*, & said: ...reverend Fathers, I haue a little booke heere of *Atha- ...sius*, which I greatlie desire to present to your father- ...hoods view and consideration: *Sancta Synodus respon- ...placet bene, & vt legatur optamus:* The holy Synode ...wered: wee are verie well pleased, and desire it ...y be read. Thus concerning the occasion: which ...a solemne Synode, to appease a foolish superstiti- ...contention amongst the lying covetous Priests of ...age; when everie hedge-priest would perswade ...simple people, that he had in his viall the very bloud ...Christ, which was of force to pardon their sinnes.

peece of Christs crosse.

Athanasius printed at Paris, 1582. pag. 534, &c.

So our Iesuits and Priests now, would perswade the Catho.

The stile of this agreeth not with the booke which ...knowne to bee *Athanasius* worke *contra Idola*: a ...eane Grammarian may see it and discerne it: and ...erefore it cannot be his worke.

2. *Reason.*

Athanasius writ a most sharp tractate against Ido- ...rie, when he was living, and now they would father ...fable vpon him after his death: and therefore it ...nnot bee his worke: for so wee should wickedlie ...arge that godlie father either with recantation of ...uth: contradiction in and with himselfe, or open ...intenance of palpable Idolatrie.

3. *Reason.*

It was taken to be *Athanasius* worke, onelie vpon ...e credit of the Popes Stipendarie chaplen *Petrus* ...shop of *Nicomedia*, as you may see in the title page, ...4. and therefore is not his worke by open confes- ...on.

4. *Reason.*

The time bewraies the forgerie: for this thing should ...done by report of your owne stories, seven hundred ...threescore yeares after Christ, vnder *Constantine* ...fift, yet coloured with *Athanasius* name, as writ- ...by him, that was dead foure hundred yeares be- ...fore

5. *Reason.*

Sigebert in anno. 755.

fore this matter hapned, and therefore plaine and palpable forgerie.

6. Reason. Actione quarta, synodi 2. Niceni, tom. 3.

It was imagined to be done some twentie yeares or thereabouts, before the second Councell of Niceno as a preparatiue for the planting of images in Churches; in which Councell it was accordinglie performed: and this fable registred in the same, as a sure foundation for such a building: and a fit proofe for such a proposition.

Now let the indifferent Reader peruse at his leisure, but the seven chapters of this Treatise, and hee shall scarce read one line without a lie. Yet superstition blusht not to insert this fable into this fathers worke. But if we should tender such prooses, and preach such fabulous stuffe for sound divinitie to the people, you would call vs sots and souleslaiers. But for Christes sake and the peoples salvation, confesse your errours and forsake them, with these lying fables: it is no shame to forsake sinne, but it is daungerous when sinne forsakes you. And so to your next proofe.

Catho. Priests. Damascen lib. 4 de fide orthod. cap. 14. flornit. 391 Ridge.

Let vs approach in ardent faith, laying our hands in manner of a crosse, and let vs receiue the bodie of him that vvas crucified.

Damascen flatlie shevveth the impossibilitie of your carnall presence.

YOu leaue out *ei*: for it is in the father, *Accedamus ei*, let vs come and approach to him, which is in heaven, not on your Altar, or in your miraculous accidents; and then sheweth the maner how: in ardent faith: not with mouth, teeth, and stomacke. So this father is against your selfe, for the manner of receiving of Christ, which is spirituall, not corporall. And in the same chapter, the same father saith, *Corpus Christi, &c.* that Christs bodie being vnited to the godhead, descended not from heaven to the earth, and therefore cannot be in your sacrament corporally and

carnallie.

[illegible]nallie. And as fire and heat be in a burning coale, [illegible] (and more) neerelie are Christs humanitie and divinitie ioyned together, so that he which shall touch the coale should taste of heat, and hee that should eate Christs humanitie, must also eate Christs divinitie: which is damnable to thinke, for a man to eate and devoure his God. But because this your impertinent proofe is your apparant disproofe, I will proceed to the next.

Cath. Priests.

This bread is bread before the consecration: but when it is consecrated, of bread it is made the flesh of Christ.

Ambr. de sacramentis, lib. 4 cap. 4. fluruit. 400.

ALl this we graunt to be true, but you come not to the point, whether Christs flesh be made of bread by way of transubstansiation: that is, by the changing of one nature or substance into another, by *hoc est corpus meum*: this is our question, but you dare not touch it, because you cannot prooue it. But seeing you recite fathers by peeces and patches, taking that you thinke will fit your purpose, and leaving that which would crosse your course or weaken your cause: I will for the trueth sake, and the Catholickes good, adde that out of *Ambrose*, which I am sure some of you would wish out of *Ambrose*. If you had read a few lines moe, you should haue heard him tell you another tale, and haue expounded himselfe in this place, his words be these: *Si ergo tanta vis est in sermone Domini Iesu, vt inciperent esse quæ non erant, quanto magis operatorius est, vt sint quæ erant, & in aliud commutentur?* If there be such a force in the word of the Lord Iesus, that the things which were not, began to bee, how much more can it worke this, that they shall be the same they were, and yet bee changed into another thing? And then bringeth in an example, how a thing may be that that it was, and yet be chaunged.

Rider.

In the same chapter.

Tu ipse eras, sed eras vetus creatura, &c. Thou t
selfe waste: but thou wast an olde creature: alt
when thou wast baptised, thou beganneſt to be a ne
creature: wilt thou know how a new creature? eve
one ſaith the Apoſtle, that is in Christ, is a new cre
ture. Learne then how the word of God is accuſt
med to change everie creature: and when he will
alreadie the courſe of nature. If you had read
knowne this, you would never haue alleadged the
ther, for his example is this: as he that is baptiſed ſu
fereth no materiall ſubſtancial or corporall chang
though he be borne a new ſpirituallie, and put
Christ. But he his changed not looſing or altring t
bodie or ſoule which hee had: but in attaining t
grace which hee had not. And ſo the change is acc
dentall, not ſubſtantiall, as from vice to vertue. So
ſubſtance the bread and wine are the ſame they we
before, but in accident or qualitie, they are turned i
to another thing, of common bread, made a Sacr
ment.

Vide diſt. 2 de conſecr. cap. quia corpus. page. 432.

So *Chriſoſtome* amplifying the change of bread
the Euchariſte, he addeth immediatlie withall: *Sic*
tiam in baptiſmo: even ſo there is the like change
water in baptiſme, as of bread in the Lords Sepp
but that is not of ſubſtance, but in qualitie, reſpe
or vſe, and ſo in this.

Chriſoſt. in Matth. hom. 83.

And this change is not in caſting away the ſubſtan
of bread or wine, but in caſting grace vnto them
Theodoret ſaith, *Non naturam ipſam tranſmutans,*
naturæ adijciens gratiam: not changing nature, but
ding grace to nature. But who can better expound
broſe his meaning then *Ambroſe* himſelfe? who ſai
Ante benedictionem, &c. before the bleſſing of the he
venlie words, it is called another kind: after the wo
of conſecration the bodie of Christ is ſignified: do
not ſay, is the bodie of Christ, but ſignifieth the bod
of Chri

Dialog. 1. cap. 8.

Ambroſe de iis qui initiantur cap. 9.

of Christ. And else where: *In comedendo & potando, &c.* eating and drinking we signifie the bodie & bloud that were offered for vs. And againe he saith, *Quod figura, &c.* which is a figure of the bodie and bloud of the Lord. But of this we haue sufficientlie spoken before. *Ambr. 1. cor. 11.* *Ambr. de Sacramentis lib. 4 cap. 4.*

And thus now the Reader may be sufficientlie satisfied that the change is not naturall, but misticall, not of substance, but of accidents and qualities. And so bread remaineth in substance, but is changed in misterie. And so is bread made the flesh of Christ, not by your miraculous transubstantiation, but by mistical and Apostolicall benediction or sanctification, not in changing the nature of it, but adding grace to it, as before-said. And thus *Ambrose* hath aunswered *Ambrose*. And if you would read him without partiall affection, hee would withdraw you from this your imagined opinion. But now to that which followeth.

Not onelie the Sacraments, but the bodie of Christ is propounded vnto vs, not that vve should touch it onely, but that vve should eate it. *Catholicke Priests. Chrisost. hom. 51. in cap. 4. Math. floruit. 410.*

GEntlemen: it is in the 51. *Hom.* of the 14. chapter of *Matheus*, not in the fourth: though it cost me great labour to finde the place, yet I blame not you, it might be the writer, not the Author: and if it were the Author, it is but the slip of his penne, and therefore in discretion pardonable. *Reader,*

But you alleadge it verie impertinentlie and improperlie: still prooving the matter never denied: and skipping the manner which I vrged, and you should aunswere. But if you had read a few lines more, *Chrysostome* would haue told you the manner how Christ is to be receiued, not by your mouth, teeth, throate or stomacke: but *Magna cum fide, munda cum corde*, with *Still you runne from the manner to the matter*

great faith and a clean heart. You ſtopt before your full period, which is in your ſtil a great fault: and will keepe ſtill the Catholickes by this your means in great blindneſſe and doubts: who beleeues when they heare you alleadge one ſentence of a Father, that all his workes are ſuteable to that, iudging him to ſpeake on your ſide by the ſound of the eare, not by the touch of knowledge: whereas if you would read a Father your ſelues from the beginning of a controuerſie to the end, though it were painfull vnto you, yet it were profitable vnto you and the Catholicks, then you ſhould ſee the thing plainlie by the father expounded, which is by you often and too much wreſted.

This father is holy with vs, & therefore vnaduiſedly brought in by you.

Read this father vpon the ſeuenteeth Homilie vpon the tenth of the *Hebrewes*, and 1. *Cor.* 11. *Hom.* 27. and you ſhall finde him there condemning your carnall preſence, maſſe, with your ſacrifice, wherby you may perceiue in this point your opinion new and doubtfull; and our religion old and certaine.

But though this place be impertinent to prooue the maine, which is our queſtion, yet it proueth with vs againſt you, that Chriſt muſt be eaten by faith ſpirituallie, not by the mouth carnallie, and that ouerthroweth one of your chiefe pillers. And ſo to your next prooſe.

Cathe. Priests.

We ought rather to beleeue in Chriſt, and humbly to learn of him, then like drunken ſots to crie out, how can he giue vs his flesh?

Cyrill in Ioh. lib. 4. cap. 13. floruit. Anno 423

Reader.

GEntlemen: I wonder you bring in this for your prooſe at all: this is nothing pertinent to our matter in hand, we crie not how can he giue vs his fleſh? For we know that hee gaue his fleſh for vs ſubſtantiallie on the croſſe: miſticallie in the Sacrament; & ſpirituallie in his word. And therefore this might haue beene rather well ſpared, then ill applied: nay

by your leaue, there is no such sentence in that
ce, as you precisely alleadge: some such sound of
nds he hath, but no such carnall sence. But read
e chapter through, and these marginall quotations,
you shal plainly see how you are deceived. For what
euer hee speaketh in all those places, is nothing else
t to confirme and explaine our spirituall vnion with
Christ our head: and for that purpose brings in for ex-
mple, the neere and naturall vnion & conjunction of
e vine and the branches, head and members, & so of
Christ and all beleevers. So this being lesse pertinent
en the rest, shal haue a more short (yet a sufficient) an-
were then the rest.

Cyrill lib. 4. cap. 14. 21. 22. 24. lib. 11. cap 26.

The bread which descended from heaven is the body of our Lord, and the wine he gaue his disciples is his blood.

Catho. Priests.

THis place in deed is in his third *Tom. pag.* 142. There was a learned and godlie woman proposed twelue questions of diuinitie to *Hieron.* wherin, & of which she desired resolution: For in those dayes, it was lawfull for women and all men to aske doubts touching religion: and for their further instruction & consolation might read Gods word, & freelie confeere touching matters that concerned their salvation. And this greatly blemisheth your Roman doctrine, that will haue neither men nor women to read diuinitie, & the reason is ths, least they should see your errors, and forsake your profession. For this is your strongest treasure, to keepe them in blindnesse with ydle ceremonies, dumbshewes, & Latten service. But I trust in Christ shortlie to see most of their eies opened, that wil discouer your priuie plots, & discourage your haughtie stomacks, and generallie forsake your new religion, being in deed but mans invention.

Hieron. ad Hedib. Q. 2. floruit Anno 424.

Rider.

Marke this yee Catholickes.

This is the second question of the twelfth, but you omit some words, & cut off some, which obscures the matter.

But if a little charitable chiding would make you more painfull in your bookes, and leſſe carefull to pleaſe mens humors, I could finde in my heart to beſtow it vpon you, but *præmoniti, præmuniti*: you are now forewarned, I hope you will bee hereafter better armed, or better minded: which I wiſh with all my ſoule as to my ſelfe. But your proofe is thus in Latten, *Si ergo panis qui de cælo deſcendit, corpus eſt Domini, & vinum quod diſcipulis dedit, ſanguis illius eſt noui Teſtamenti qui pro multis effuſus eſt in remiſſionem peccatorum, iudaicas fabulas repellamus, &c.* If therefore the bread that deſcended from heaven bee the bodie of the Lord, and the wine which he gaue his diſciples, be his bloud of the new teſtament which is ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſinnes, then let vs caſt away all Iewiſh fables.

Here you omit *Si ergo*, and *noui Teſtamenti qui pro multis effuſus eſt in remiſſionem peccatorum. If therefore: and of the newe Teſtament which is ſhed for manie for the remiſſion of ſinnes*: All this you haue left out, which was ill done.

What now can you gather out of this, to prooue that Chriſtes bodie is made of bread, and his bloud of wine, no ſubſtance of either creature remaining, but onelie Chriſts carnall preſence as he was on the croſſe? Surelie here is not one word, ſillable, or letter to prooue it, but the contrarie. You wronged the father ſo to mangle him: yet as you deliuer him, it prooueth nothing of the manner of Chriſts preſence that is in queſtion, but the matter neuer in controuerſie: for ſaith ſhee to this learned father, if therefore the bread which came downe from heaven bee the bodie of Chriſt: to ſhe ſpeakes of Chriſts diuinitie, that came downe from heaven: (for his humanitie did not) and our queſtion is of his humanitie by tranſubſtantiation in the Sacrament: ſo that this prooſe nothing ſorteth

your

your purpose. And the bloud here spoken of, is his bloud of the new Testament shed on the crosse, not in the Sacrament; once for all, not for anie that pleasish the Priest. And therefore as she said, *Iudaicas fabulas repellamus*, let vs cast away Jewish fables; So in Gods name for the loue of Gods trueth, and of the peoples salvation, cast yee from you all Munkish fables, and forged legends, that haue milled the people into this blinde superstition, and ioyne with vs to teach Christs precious flocke, the old Apostolicall and Catholicke religion, commaunded in Gods word, & practised in the primitiue Church; that you with vs, and we with you, and all in the Lord, may now in this plentifull vintage so labour in the Lords vinyard (his Church) according to our talents received, that every one of vs may deliver his talent with advantage of manie soules; and then we shall be partakers of that sweet saying, *Well done, thou good and faithfull servant, enter into thy maisters ioy*. Which God graunt to vs both, And so to the next, as followeth.

Catholicke Priests.

The mediator betwixt God and man Iesus Christ, with faithfull heart and mouth vve receiue, giving vs his flesh to eate and his bloud to drinke. Although it seeme more horrible to eate the flesh of man then to kill: and to drinke the bloud of man then to sheed it.

August. contra Aduersar. legis & prophetarum: cap. 9. floruit 430.

Rider.

Paris print, page 264.

AVgustine writing against that pestilent adversarie of the Law and Prophets, who obiected, that because *Abraham* by adulterie with *Agar* brake the Law, therefore either the Law was not good, or else the vniversall promise made to God by *Abraham* was of none effect; confuting him by scriptures and reasons, telleth him, that the promise was made in *Isaack*, not in *Ismaell*, and disprooveth him for disliking such figures, similitudes, and comparisons, as it

hath

hath pleased the holie Ghost to vse for the plaine ex-
pressing of the neere vnion and conjunction that is
betwixt Christ and his Church. And faith, what will
this pestilent adversarie say, when hee heareth *Paul*
speake? *they shall be two in one flesh*, he will scorne and
deride it. But it is a great misterie (spoken of Christ
and his Church. For saith *Augustine*, we vnderstand by
the two sonnes of *Abraham*, and the two mothers,
two Testaments, though in respect of times and cere-
monies, divers, but in respect of the substance all one
and the same. And also by the neere vnion and con-
junction betwixt man and wife, we vnderstand our na-
turall vnion with Christ, and that without anie ob-
scenitie or absurditie, maugre the beards of the adver-
sarie. Then followes your proofe, even in the middest
of a sentence verie vntowardlie, I will not say negli-
gentlie. And yet you omit one word (*Sicut*) which
though it be small in shew, yet it is in this place of great
consequence.

Eph. 5.

For as you alleadge *Augustine*, it is nothing material
to confute the adversarie of Gods grace. Thus *Au-
gustine* speaketh, and so you should haue said, *Sicut me-
diatorem Dei & hominum*: as the mediator betwixt God
and man, &c. And thus after your wonted manner, you
leaue out the point materiall, & begin in the middle
of a sentence, leaving out beginning and ending, nei-
ther respecting what went before, whereof, & where-
fore he spake the thing: nor what followeth after to
prooue & disprooue the thing so spoken of. And this
your neglecting the coherence, makes you faile in the
sence and inference. For this word (*Sicut*) which you
leaue out, sheweth plainlie that it is a similitude, and I
hope you know that similitudes be no *Syllogismes*. And
as there was no obscenitie or absurditie in the simili-
tude of marriage (they twaine shall be one flesh) so in
like case, here is no absurditie or inhumaine Cannibal-

lisme,

stine, In this similitude of the Sacrament, vsed to expresse our vnion with Christ: for though it seem more horrible to eate the flesh of man, then to kill man, and to drinke his bloud then to shed it: yet we without horror or absurditie, eat the flesh and drinke the bloud of the Mediator betwixt God & man Iesus Christ. And if the adversarie in *Augustines* time, or you Romanists now, would know how this may bee so done without slaughter of Christ, sinne to our soules, or offence to the world, *Augustine* tells you in that place, *fideli corde & ore*, with a faithfull heart and mouth.

So that now you see *Augustines* scope, and your drift, cleane contrarie the one to the other: for *Augustine* brings it as a similitude to expresse our spirituall vnion with Christ by faith: you wrest it as spoken of the corporall and gutturall eating and drinking of Christs bodie and bloud in the Sacrament, vnder the formes of bread and wine with our mouths and stomackes. Manie places you haue vnfitlie, & indeed vntrulie alleadged: yet shewed in none of them lesse learning and true meaning, then in this. For this is your great fault, that whersoever you see or heare in Scripture, Father, Councell, or historie: *Corpus & sanguinem Domini*, or such like words or phrases, presentlie you inferre (and so perswade the Catholicks) that there is Christs carnal presence in the Sacrament, never examining the circumstance of the place, or the end wherefore they bee alleadged.

And thus you erre not knowing (or wilfullie contemning) the state of the question, the sence of the holie writ, and iudgement of the auncient Fathers.

I am sure you never read this place of *Augustine* your selfe, but snatcht it out of some late ignorant and foolish ydle Munkish or Franciscan *Enchiridion*.

And my reason why I thinke so of you, is drawen out of *Augustine* himselfe. For a few lines before this your proofe, he calleth the Sacraments *Sacra signa*, holie signes (not the things themselues as you doe) and so distinguisheth that which you confound. And within three lines after your proofe, if you would haue read him, you should haue heard him record to your great discredit in this case, that this your proofe is (as other former examples are) *figurate dictum secundum sacra fidei regulam*: that it is spoken figuratiuelie, according to the rule of sound faith and religion.

Augustine in his place as in the places formerly alledged, is against you still.

Now let the Reader iudge betwixt you and mee, whether of vs is in the right. *Augustine* saith, the Sacraments be *sacra signa*, holie signes, and so say wee: But you Iesuiters and Priests say no, they be the things themselues. *Augustine* saith it is spoken figuratiuelie, and so say we: you say no, but properlie. *Augustine* saith, that this opinion is squared out for patterne to Christs Church, by the straight rule of sound faith, and so say we: and as you alleadge your proofe, you say no: & make a flat opposition betwixt *Augustines* faith and your faith. And yet you will brag of Fathers, and that they all speake on your side, and you all follow their sayings: when they neither speake for you, nor you imitate them. And so though we follow scripture, fathers, & primitiue Church, yet you call vs heretickes. And you that wrest scriptures, falsifie fathers, that haue neither with you, consent, antiquitie, nor veritie, yet will be Catholickes.

And thus if a man should haue hired you to haue brought a place out of *Augustine* against your selues, you could no better haue fitted your selfe, or your setter on, then in this: who verie plainlie delivereth the manner how Christs bodie and bloud is to bee eaten and drunke: that is, with a faithfull heare and mouth, not with our materiall mouth, teeth, and stomacke, as

you

is you vntrulie teach. And thus hoping the Catholicks will lesse trust you in the rest, that haue so grossie deceived them in this, I will proceed by Christes assistance to the examination of your next proofe.

Catho. Priests.

In vvhat darknesse of ignorance, in vvhat sluggish carelesnesse, haue they been? as not to haue heard by hearesay, nor by reading to haue found, vvhich in the Church of God is so plaine, as that the mouthes of children do tell, the bodie and bloud of Christ to be trulie in the blessed sacrament.

Leo epist. 22. ad Clerum & plebem Constantinopolitanæ vrbis floruit Anno. 466.

GEntlemen, you mistake the Epistle: it is in the 23. Epistle, pag. 74. beginning in the 12 line, printed at *Lovaine*, 1575. and seeing it is both your owne proofe, and your own print, if vpon due examination it make against you, you must thinke God dealeth with you, as he did with *Balaam*, who when he made account for gaine to haue cursed Gods people, then God put into his heart, and vttered by his mouth a blessing to his people. You made account to haue here overthrowne the trueth, established errour, and strengthned your credit: and God hath put into your heart, and you haue subscribed with your hand to confirme the trueth, confute your owne error, and discredit your selues: and more to the worlds wonder, & the foile of your Romane faith, even by a Bishop of Rome: against whom you can take no exceptions. So that now the Catholicks shall see that your carnall presence was not known to the first bishops of Rome for the first fiue hundred yeares, and therefore it is not Catholicke. And you shall see how vntrulie you not onelie quot him, but alleadge him, nay wrest and infore him to speake that after his death, which hee never meant during his life. So that from the first to the last, you deale neither trulie with the booke of God: nor the works of men.

Rider.

This Leo was the 13. Archb. of Rome: & twentie more succeeded him before any vsurpod the name of Pope.

Nomb. 23. 8.

of men. And as Christ saide to the Scribes and Phareſees; *You haue made the commaundment of God of no Authoritie by your Tradition.* So you Ieſuites and Prieſts haue made neither Scripture, Auncient father, Councell, or Pope of anie Authoritie, by your new and falſe conſtructions, addicions, and ſubtracions, &c. But now to the examination of your proofe.

Mathew. 15. 6.

But I will firſt ſhowe to the Catholicks the occaſion, why *Leo* witt this: and there they ſhall ſee how greatly you are deceaued in miſtaking *Leo*: and much at uſe their ſimplicitie and the credite they repoſe in you.

The occaſion whie *Leo* writte this Epiſtle was this: That whereas the errour of the *Manichees* had greatlie infected the Church of God throughout all Chriſtendome: he in a charitable manner ſent *Epiphanius* and *Dionyſius*, two publike Notaries of the Church of Rome, to the Cleargie and people of *Conſtantinople* requeſting them, that ſuch as profeſſed theſe dammable hereſies, might not onelie bee excommunicated from ſermons & ſacraments, but alſo be baniſhed from their Citties for feare of further infection. For (ſaith hee) ſuch as beleeue not that Chriſt hath taken our nature and fleſh vpon him, beleeue neither the veritie, nor vertue of Chriſts paſſion and reſurrection. And then commeth in your proofe, which properlie muſt be applied to ſuch hereticks, as denie Chriſt his manhood to bee borne of the bleſſed virgin: and hold that his bodie is not a true bodie, but a phantaſticall bodie, and not to vs that beleeue both. Againe, you haue not truelie tranſlated this place: for thus it ſtands in the Author. *In quibus iſte ignorantiæ tenebris, in quo hactenus deſidia torpore iacuere, vt nec auditu diſcerent:* and afterwards, *Vt nec ab infantium linguis veritas corporis, & ſanguinis Chriſti inter communia ſacramenta fides teneatur?* In what

They denied Chriſts manhood, & taught that his bodie was not a true bodie but a phantaſticall bodie.

darknes

thines of ignorance, in what sluggish carelesnes, haue they remained, as not to haue learned by heare say (not heard by heare say as you translate) that the trueth of the bodie and bloud of Christ among the sacraments of our common faith, is not kept backe even of the tongues of infants?

It seemeth you had this out of some mans note-booke by *heare say*, not by your proper and diligent reading of the Authour himselfe: and my reasons why I thinke so, be there: because you mistake so much, and translate so vntrue. Yet will not I take exceptions to everie particular fault.

1 First, you say it is in the two and twentieth Epistle, it is not so, but in the three and twentieth, and therefore I thinke you never read the Author.

2 Secondlie, you say, *heard by heare say*, the Author saith, *Learned by heare say*.

3 Thirdly, you translate *linguis* for mouths: it should be tongues. Yet if the rest had been true, I would not haue excepted against this.

4 Fourthlie, you chaunge a Nowne into an Adverb, *vere* for *veritas*, trulie for trueth: and transpose it also out of that proper place to alter the sence of *Leo* the Bishop of Rome, which is great wrong to the dead Author, and liuing Reader.

5 Fifthe, you change the singular number for the plurall, sacrament for sacraments.

Sixtlie, you quite leaue out two wordes of great consequence, *communis* and *fidei*.

7 Seuenthlie, you adde this word (*Blessed*) which is not in the Author.

8 Eighthlie, you point it not right, considering the Authour spake it onelie by way of interrogation.

Which premisses, are faultes great and grosse, which sheweth plainlie that you never reade the

Author himself, but borrowed them forth of some o-ther mans papers, & therfore you sin grieuously in perswading mens consciences to take these things at your hands for truth, & faith, when in deed you tender them nothing, but things wrested from all faith and truth.

Now Gentlemen, doe you deale plainlie with the world in bringing this place against vs? did ever anie of vs denie that Christ was borne of the virgin *Marie*, and and conceived by the holie Ghost? you cannot charge vs with it. Did ever anie of vs teach that Christs bodie was phantasticall, neither did you ever heare it. Then in this as in the rest you wrong vs, deceive the Catholickes, and abuse *Leo* sometime Pope.

But I will shew you plainlie, that this Bishoppe of Rome, and this your proofe, confutes and confounds your owne opinion, and confirmes ours.

Reade page. 7.8. in the same Epist. where he bringes in the Sacraments of Redemption & of Regeneration.

First *Leo* saith, the trueth of Christs bodie and bloud is in both the two sacraments, as well in Baptisme as in the Lords Supper: and as he is reallie in the one, so is he reallie in the other: and what presence of Christ is in the one sacrament, there is the like presence in the other, as hath been prooved before. But least this would marre the fashion of your transubstantiation, and carnall presence, therefore you translate it *sacramentum*, in the singuler number, not *sacramenta* in the plurall.

Secondlie, you haue left out two words, *communis fidei*: of common faith: because no man should see it was then a Catholick opinion, to beleeue that the truth of Christs bodie and bloud, was as reall e in Baptisme, as in the Lords Supper, yet in both spirituallie, in neither corporallie.

But you will say I abuse the Reader, because I *Leo* neuer spake of this word spirituall, or spirituallie, & therfore I wrong both the Author & Reader. I answere as *Elias* the Prophet answered *Achab* the king, when he told *Elias* hee troubled Israel: (saith the Prophet)

it is

in thou and thy Fathers house that haue troubled Israell, in that you haue forsaken the commandement of the Lord, and followed Balaam. So Gentlemen, it is not I that wrong the Author that is dead, or the people that yet liue; but it is you and your confederates that followe *Balaam* of Rome (God keep you free from so lowing *Balack* of Spaine) and that the Reader shall see I will proove that *Leo* ioyneth with vs, and we with him, and both of vs with Christs trueth against your trash, I wil make him speake in his owne defence, and vtter that which you concealed. It followeth imediatlie after your prose, in the next immediat words after this maner: *quia in illa mistica distributione spiritualis alimonia hoc impartitur, vt accipientes celestis cibi, in carnem ipsius, qui caro nostra factus est, transeamus.* Because that in the misticall distribution of that spirituall food, this is giuen and receiued, that we which receiue the vertue of that heauenlie meat, wee passe into his flesh, which was made our flesh. 1. Kings. 18. 17. 18. *In the same page.*

Gentlemen, this you should haue added to your former, for the Author ioyned them togither, the one to accompanie the other in Gods seruice, and in deed the latter to expresse the former. But now let vs out of this, but compare the old doctrine of the old Bishoppes of Rome, and the doctrine of the moderne Popes and his Chaplens.

1 The old Bishops of Rome said, the food in the sacrament was spirituall and heauenlie: the late Popes, Iesuits, and Priests say, that it is carnall and materiall.

2 The old Popes said, the distribution of that spirituall food was misticall: you say presbiteriall.

3 They said in old times, that the worthie receiuers of this spirituall meat were transformed into Christ his flesh. The late Popes and you his Eccbos say no: But the sacramentall bread and wine are transubstantiated and transnatured into Christs flesh and bloud.

4 The

4 The Bishop of Rome brought in this, to proue Christs humanitie conceived by the holie Ghost, and borne of the virgin *Marie*, against hereticks, who taught that Christs bodie was phantasticall, And you alleadge the same place to proue Christs humanitie to be made by a sinfull ignorant Priest, & that of bread and so contrarie to Scripture and Creed, will recreate Christ of a new matter, which is as blasphemous and hereticall.

So Tertull: contra Marcion lib. 4.

5 The olde Bishoppes and Church of Rome held that the Sacraments could not be true signes of Christs bodie, vnlesse he had a true bodie, and because they were true signes, therfore Christ had a true bodie. And the late popes and Papelings teach, that Christs bodie is made a new of the signes, and so counfoundeth the signes with Christs bodie, and in deed maintaineth an heresie as grosse as the *Manicheans*. For they held that either he had no bodie, or a phantasticall bodie. And you hold that there be no signes in the Sacraments, but

Iohn. 6.

that they are transubstantiated into Christs bodie and bloud. And so Christs bodie is dailie made of a peece of bread, which must needs be a bodie phantasticall: not a true bodie as our Creed witnesseth. And as in the manner of eating Christs bodie, you disagree not much from the *Capernaits*: so in this case you differ not much from the *Manicheis*.

Isaie. 5. 3.

Now will I say as the painfull owner of the vineyard said. *Nowv therefore oh you Inhabitants of Ierusalem and men of Iudah, iudge I pray you, betvveen me and my vineyard.* So, oh you Inhabitants of this worshipfull Cittie of *Dublin*, and you loyall subiects of Ireland, and all the learned and well minded of both England and Ireland, iudge I pray you charitablie (yet trulie) betwixt me and these my adversaries, And if you refuse

1. Sam. 24. 13.

to censure vs and this our conference according to the trueth, then I say as *David* said to *Saul*: *The Lord be iudge*

Judge betweene thee and me: so the Lord be iudge betwixt vs, whether of vs haue more trulie, and with greater sinceritie of trueth, and conscience, behaved our selues (in this matter) for his glorie, discharge of our owne consciences, instruction and salvation of the Catholickes.

Catho. Priests.

Thus much for the fathers, as a skanthing or taste, leaving the surplus to the curious Reader. I might haue recited Martial Epist. ad Burdegalenses, cap. 3. Anacleti Epist. general: Dionysius Areop. cap. 3. page. 3. vvho lived vvithin the compasse of the first hundred yeares: but I obserue (a) breuitie, as by the next proofe shall appeare.

(a) *I praie you obserue veritie.*

I thinke your meaning vvas 500 years, otherwise it cannot be true.

GEntlemen: *Martiall* neither in this place, nor in the tenne chapters following, saith anie thing against vs, but for vs, & as I thinke altogither against you. For *Martiall* reproueth those that honoured such Priests, as sacrificed *mutis & surdis statuis*, to dumbe and deaffe images (which neerlie toucheth your freeholde) and deswaded them from it, saying *Nunc autem multo magis sacerdotes Dei omnipotentis qui vitam vobis tribuunt in calice & pane honorare debetis*: For now you ought much rather to honour the Priests of Almightie God, which giue you life in the cup and bread. This is that which you thinke knocks vs in the head. But first let it be examined, and then censured.

Rider.

Martiall.

1 First, you must prooue that you are Priests of Almightie God: which you shall never do; as hath been plainlie prooved.

2 Secondlie, you must prooue that you giue life to the communicants, in the cuppe and bread, which is impossible. And vnlesse you prooue the premisses, the allegation is impertinent.

3 Thirdlie and lastlie, if the Priest could giue life in the cup, wine or bread, then it were cleare that the substance of bread & wine remained. And that would knocke out the braines of your miraculous transubstantiation. Now maisters, in alleadging *Martiall* you are brought into a labyrinth, get out as you can. For if you ever had read *Martiall*, you would never haue alleadged him in this case: for in the end of the same chapter, hee sneweth to *Sigebert*, and to others newly converted from ydolatrie, *ad sinceram fidem*, to true religion, that Christ is sacrificed three maner of waies.

First, by himselfe on the crosse once for all.

Secondlie, by the cruell Iewes, who cried, *Crucifie him crucifie him.*

Thirdlie, *per nos in sui commemorationem*; by vs in rememberance of him. Thus *Martiall* telleth you that in rememberance of Christ, is not Christ. Now if you will needs sacrifice Christ after *Martiall's* opinion, you must chuse one of these three: after the first if you would you cannot: after the second, I am sure yee will not, and after the third you ought, but do not. Thus your prooses mend, as sower Ale doth in Sommer, woorse and woorse, even like a conie in a net: or a bird amongst limetwigs, the more they stirre, the faster they sticke. But you cannot helpe it, seeing the cause is bad, how can your prooses bee good? But in Gods name leaue wresting of Fathers, deceiving of Catholickes, and come to the confession of your faults, and recantation of your errors: and you shall glorifie God, edifie his people, and saue your soules, which God graunt for Christs sake.

Anaclete. For *Anaclete*, I haue not seen him, and therfore cannot censure him: but if he be auncient, he will speake with vs: if he be a late writer, hee is a weake witnesse: and at first excepted against: and unlesse he lived within the first fiue hundred yeares after Christ, he must ner-

ther

ther helpe you, nor hurt vs.

And for *Dionisius Areop.* because he speaketh not one word for you, therfore I haue no reason to speake one word against him. And wheras you say, these fathers you haue brought as a scantling or taste: I tell you plainlie, scant a taste of anie truth. And the fathers you haue not brought with you, but left them behind you, because yee know they would witnesse what they should, not what you would. Then you say, you will leaue the *Surplus* to the curious Reader: by your leaue, it is better to be curious then carelesse. For if the Reader had not been more carefull then you were, it had been *informe Chaos*, and as *Ovid* once said, *Rudis indigestaque moles, nec quicquam nisi pondus inter.* But now to the rest.

Dionisius Areop.

Ovid. Metam. lib. 1. page. 1.

The third proofe.

That the chiefe Protestants did beleeue the real presence, and alleadged all the Fathers for the maintenance thereof.

Catho. Priests.

THis trulie is vvorthie admiration, that none of the fathers, vvhereof there is an infinite number, but did speake cleane contrarie to Sacramentaries. And though the fathers all vvith one mouth affirme: yet the Sacramentaries harden themselues to denie them.

Luther Tom. 7. Defens. verb. cana. fol. 391.

And they vvould never vtter this (that Christ his bodie is not in the blessed Sacrament) if they had anie regard of the Scripture: and vvere not their hearts full of infidelitie.

Idem fol. 390.

I trulie, vvould giue the franticke Sacramentaries this advise, that seeing they vvill needes bee mad they should play their parts rather vvhollie then in part: therefore let them make short vvorke, and raze out of the scripture these vvords, This is my bodie which is given for you. *For touching their faith it is all one, if thus they kepe*

Idem. in fol. 41.

Christ tooke bread and gaue thankes, brake it, and gaue it to his Disciples saying, take, eate, doe this in remembrance of mee. *For this prooveth sufficientlie, that bread is to be eaten in remembrance of Christ. This is the vvhole and entire Supper of the Sacramentaries.*

In vaine doe the Sacramentaries beleeue in God the father, God the Sonne, and God the holie Ghost: seeing they denie this one article as false, of the read presence, vvhereas Christ doth say, This is my bodie.

The whole opinion of the sacrament, the Sacramentaries began vvith lies, and vvith lies they defend the same.

Luther Tom. 2. fol. 263.

Luther in Ep. ad Joh. Harnagiũ Typograph. Argent. Rider.

De Cons. dist. 2. canon. prom. in glossa. torti a tenet page. 429.

GEntlemen: you knowe *Luther* was a Munke, and though he recanted Poperie, and vtterlie condemned your Transubstansiation as a fable, having neither scripture nor Father to warrant it: yet he stuck fast in another error, fitlie named (a) Consubstansiation, which errour hee also suckt from the Popes owne brest, as you may see in his distinctions. For you in your Transubstansiation teach, that of the substance of bread and wine is made by the Priest the verie naturall bodie and bloud of Christ; no substance of either remaining, but onelie the outward formes.

Luther by his Consubstansiation saith, that Christs bodie and bloud bee received togither in the bread, vnder or with the bread; both substance & accidents of bread and wine remaining.

Now I pray you, how fitteth this your purpose? you will say in this, that *Luther* held a reall presence. True, but *Luther* denied your reall presence as a fable. And yet his opinion was farre wide from the trueth. Wee regard not *Luthers* censure against vs, for Christ his spirituall presence, no more then you doe for his condemning of your Transubstansiation. And *Luther* is more to bee commended, then all the Popes, Cardinals,

(a) *Luthers heresie vvas in Rome before Luthers vvas horne.*

dinals, Priests, and Iesuits in Christendome: who with Augustine, though he did erre, yet would not perseuer in errors, as you and they doe, least he shoule be an hereticke, and therefore in his Epistle to the Christian Reader, faith in this manner: *Ante omnia oro pium lectorem, & oro propter Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, ut ista legat cum iudicio, imo & cum multa miseratione, & sciat me fuisse aliquando Monachum.* Before all things, or first of all, I beseech the godlie Reader, and I beseech him for our Lord Iesus Christ his sake, that he will read these my workes indiciallie, & with great compassion and pittie; and let him knowe and vnderstand that I was somtimes a Monke. As if he should say: if I haue erred, or doe erre, impute that to my Monkerie & Poperie, which in deed is but a forge of lies, and a legend of lies.

Ad Lectorem Tom. 1. page. 1.

Quid aquinus petipotuit?

But because you say *Luther* helde a reall presence: therefore you conclude against vs with his testimonie, because you call him a chiefe Protestant, perswading the Catholickes, that either some chiefe Protestants be of your opinion touching your reall presence: or else that there is a iarte amongst our selues touching the same. And because few of you haue read *Luther* (as appeareth by your omissions, transpositions, and your imperfect translation) and therefore, in this point, know not exactlie the difference betwixt your selues, *Luther*, and vs, I will plainlie and trulie set downe the three severall opinions touching this question; that the Reader may see wherin the differnce one from another, or agreement one with another consisteth. The manner (Christ willing) shall bee by question and aunswere, as followeth.

The Priests thinke euerie real presence to be their Transubstantiated reall presence.

1. Question.

2. Questi. WHat is given in the Lords Supper besides bread and wine?

1. Answ. 2. Answere.

First, you say, the bodie and bloud of Christ.

Secondlie, Luther saith, the bodie and bloud of Christ.

Thirdlie, we say, the bodie and bloud of Christ.

1. Questi. 2. Quest. How is Christs bodie and bloud given in the sacrament?

2. Answ. 2. Ans. You say corporallie.

Luther saith, corporallie.

We say with scriptures and fathers, spiritualllie.

3. Questi. 3. Quest. In what thing is Christs bodie and bloud given?

3. Answ. 3. Ans. You say, vnder the formes or accidents of bread, the substance being quite chaunged, the accidents onelie remaining.

Luther saith, in, with, or vnder the bread, neither substance nor accidents changed, but both remaining.

We with scriptures and fathers say, Christs bodie and bloud are given in his mercifull promise, which tendereth whole Christ with all his benefites vnto the soule of man, sealed and assured vnto vs in the worthie receiving of the sacraments.

4. Questi. 4. Quest. How must Christs bodie and bloud bee received?

4. Answ. 4. Ans. You say, with the mouth.

Luther saith, with the mouth and faith.

Wee say according to the holie scriptures, that Christ must be received by faith: and there lodge & dwell in our hearts: for whatsoever Christ giues by promise, must of man be received by faith.

5. Questi. 5. Quest. To what part of man is Christes bodie and bloud given?

5. Answ. 5. Ans. You say, to your bodies, which is absurd.

Luther saith, both to bodie & soule, which is impossible

Wee

We say, to our soules: for the promise is spirituall; the things promised, spirituall; the meanes to receiue them, spirituall: so the place into which it must bee received, must needs be spirituall, not corporall; not that the substance of Christs bodie is vnited to our spirits: but that these precious benefits purchased for vs in the crucified bodie of Christ, must be vnited to our spirits by faith. This doctrine is Apostolicall, sound, and Catholicke, vppon which wee boldlie may venture our soules and salvations.

Quest. To whom is Christs bodie and bloud given? 6. Questi.

Auns. You say, to the godlie or godlesse, beleevers and infidels, as hath been aboue said. 6. Aunsw.

Luther saith, both to the godlie and godlesse.

We say, onelie to the godlie beleevers, as heeretofore hath been prooved.

Quest. What doe the wicked eate in the Lords supper? 7. Questi.

Auns. You say, accidents of bread, and Christs bodie. 7. Aunsw.

Luther saith, the wicked eat bread, both substance and accidents, and the bodie of Christ also.

We say, the wicked eate nothing in the Lords supper, but bare bread, and drinke nothing but meere wine, being the outward elements of the sacrament. As for the inward grace of the Sacrament, which is Christ crucified with all his merits, they eate not, they receiue not: because they haue neither a liuelie faith to receiue him, nor a purified heart by faith to intertaine him. And therefore they onelie eate as Iudas did, and as Augustine said: *Illi manducabant panem Dominum, illi panem Domini contra Dominum.* The godlie eate bread the Lord: the wicked onelie the bread of the Lord against the Lord. Tract. 59. super Iohn page. 205.

Quest. What is it to eate Christs bodie? 8. Questi.

Auns. You say, carnallie to eate Christs flesh with your 8. Aunsw.

your bodilie mouth, &c.

Luther saith, carnallie to eate Christs flesh, and spiritualie to beleeue in him.

Wee say, with the Scriptures, that to beleeue that all Christs merits are ours, and purchased for vs in his passion. This is to eat Christs bodie, as hath been alreadie prooued.

9. Questi. 9 *Quest.* What is it to drinke Christs bloud?

9. Aunsw. 9 *Aunsw.* You say, carnallie to drinke his bloud.

Luther saith, carnallie and spiritualie.

We say with the scriptures; it is to beleeue that Christs bloud was shed on the crosse for our sinnes.

10. Questi. 10 *Quest.* How is bread made Christs bodie?

10. Aunsw. 10 You say, by Transubstantiation.

Luther saith, by Consubstantiation.

We say, by appellation, signification, or representation, as aforesaid.

11. Questi. 11 *Quest.* Where is Christs bodie?

11. Aunsw. 11 *Aunsw.* You say everie where.

Luther saith, every where.

Both of you erre, for then Christ should not haue a true bodie.

We say, according to Scripture and Creed, onelie in heaven.

12. Quest. 12 *Quest.* How is Christ every where?

12 Aunsw. 12 *Aunsw.* You say, according to both natures.

Luther saith, according to both natures.

But both of you speak Monkerie & Peperie.

We say with Scriptures and Fathers, as hath been prooued, onely according to his Godhead.

Now gentle Reader, you see the agreement & difference that is betwixt the Papists, Lutherans, and Protestants. And how impertinentlie (I will not say vnschollerlike) this is brought against vs, which neither helpeth their carnall presence, nor hurteth our faith

touching

touching Christs spiritual! presence. And now to the rest that followeth.

Amongst factions of opinions, some latelie take avvay the bodie and bloud of Christ, touching his reall presence, contrarie to the most plaine, most evident, and puissant vvords of Christ.

Catho. Priests. *Magdeburg. in Epist. ad Eliz. Anglia Reg. Rider.*

GEntlemen, this concerneth not vs: it may fitter be inverted vpon your selues, for we denie not Christs spirituall presence taught in the Scriptures, and received in Christs Primitiue Church; but we denie your imagined carnall presence, never recorded in Gods booke, nor beleeved of auncient father, nor ever knowne to Christs spouse the Primitiue Church: as you haue heard trulie prooved. But this is your great fault vsuallie practised, that whether in Scriptures or Fathers you heare of Christs bodie and bloud, and his presence, or reall presence: you imagine presently without further examination, that it is your carnall presence, which thing is growne vp with you from a private errour to a publike heresie.

Tyndall, Frith, Barnes, Cranmer, left it as a thing indifferent to beleeue the reall presence. So that the adoration (saith Frith) be taken avvay, because there then remaineth no poison, vvhereof anie ought to be afraid of. Yet Kemnitius vpon the assurance of the reall presence, approoveth the custome of the Church, in adoring Christ in the Sacrament by the authoritie of Saint Augustine, and S. Ambrose, in Psal 98. Eusebius Emissenus, &c. Saint Gregorie Nazianzen: and saith it is impietie to doe the contrarie. So that the brood being of such agreement vve haue the lesse occasion to embusie our braines to confute them.

Catho. Priests. *Fox in Martyrol. Kemnitius in Exam. Conc. Trid. contra eam de Eucharistia.*

GEntlemen: by peeces you repeat some of their words, not knowing (as it seemeth) the occasion; and so you vtterlie mistake the sence, which was this. These godlie Martirs perceiving the flame of persecution to burne so fast, and mount so high, as it was neither bounded in measure nor mercie: and onelie for a new vpstart opinion, having no warrant from Gods word. They in a Christian & brotherlie discretion, exhorted the learned bretheren, onelie to preach that necessarie Article of our free iustification by faith in the personall merits of Christ. And touching the Lords Supper, to teach to the people the right vse of the same: yet not to meddle with the manner of the presence, for feare of daunger, if not death: but leaue it as a thing indifferent, till the matter in a time of peace might be reasoned at large on both parties by the learned. Provided ever, that poisonfull adoration be taken away. The premisses considered, what can yee now gather, that prooveth with you, or disprooveth vs: Nay, heere is nothing but against you altogither. For if you had dealt trulie with the dead Martirs, or the liuing Catholickes, these collections (and not yours) you should from hence haue gathered.

1 First, these Martirs taught with their breath, and sealed with their bloud, that your carnall presence and transubstantiated Christ, was neither commandement given by God, nor Article of our faith ever taught in the primitiue Church, but a late inuented opinion deuised by man.

2 Secondlie, they wished the bretheren (considering it was but mans invention, and never recorded in gods booke) that therefore they should not hazard the losse of their liues, which would tend so much to the preiudice of Christs Church.

3 Thirdlie, they wished it to be taken for a season as a thing indifferent, yet not absolutelie, but with

these

these cautions.

1 First, that adoration or worshipping of the creatures were quite taken away, which never was done by you: and therefore they held it not absolutely indifferent.

2 Secondlie, till the Church of Christ had peace and rest from your bloudie and butcherly slaughters, wherein the matter might be decided, not with faggots, but scriptures: which was not graunted in their daies: and therefore you greatlie wrong the dead, when you make them speake that thing absolutelie, which was limitted by them with conditions.

Now I appeall to the indifferent Reader, whether you deserue not a sharpe reproofe, thus to dazell the eies and amaze the minds of the simple Catholickes, by violent wresting the writings of the martirs, perswading the ignorant, that they should either dissent in this opinion amongst themselues, consent with you, or varie from vs. Whereas both they and we, then and now, consent with Scriptures, Fathers, and Primitiue Church, in vnitie and veritie of doctrine, against your dissentions, pestiferous errours, and open blasphemies. And next, you bring in another learned Protestant *Chemnitius*, who (you say) alleadgeth *Augustine*, *Ambrose*, and *Gregorie Nazianzen*, to approoue your adoration in your sacrament: Intimating to the world, that we should either allow that in you which publikely we preach against; or else, that we should be at a discord amongst our selues touching this your opinion. But the matter being exactlie examined out of these Fathers themselues, and not by your *Enchiridions* or *hearesay*, the Catholickes shall see you wrong vs, and abuse them. And first, it seemeth verie plaine, you never saw or at least never read *Chemnitius*, and my reasons bee these.

First, you know not so much as his right name, much

teſſe his preciſe opinion, for you miſſpel his name, *Kemnitius* for *Chemnitius*, which had been a ſmall faule if you had rightlie alleadged him touching the matter. For your *Tridentine* Canon commaundeth an externall or outward worſhip of Chriſt in the Sacrament vnder the formes of bread and wine. And *Chemnitius* hee condemneth your outward worſhippe for ydolatrous, and teacheth onelie an inward ſpirituall worſhip. And to proone what I ſay, I will trulie alleadge your Canon; then *Chemnitius* his examination of it, and then let the Catholickes but iudge indifferentlie whether of vs deal more trulie and ſyncerelie in this caſe. This is your Canon: *Si quis dixerit in ſanctiſſimo Euchariſtiæ ſacramento Chriſtum vnigenitum Dei filium, non eſſe cultu latriæ etiam exteriori adorandũ & ſolemniter circumgeſtandum, &c. Anathema ſit:* That is, if anie man ſhall ſay that in the bleſſed ſacrament of thankſgiving, that Chriſt the onelie begotten Sonne of God, is not to bee worſhipped with that outward and divine worſhip which is proper and due onelie to God, as well when the Sacrament is caried about in proceſſion, as in the lawfull vſe of the ſame, let him be accurſed. *Martyn Chemnitius* examining this your Canon, firſt condemneth your fained Tranſubſtantiation, and ſheweth the reaſon: for ſaith he, vnleſſe the Church of Rome had deviſed this Tranſubſtantiation, you ſhould have been palpable ydolaters, worſhipping the creatures for Chriſt. And therefore ſhe imagined that the ſubſtance of bread and wine were quite chaunged into Chriſts bodie & bloud, no ſubſtance of them remaining, leſt the ſimpleſt ſhould ſpie their ydolatrie.

'Conc. part. 2. canon. 6. page. 434. page. 435. 436. 437.

Secondlie, he expreſſlie condemneth your outward worſhip as ydolatrous, and ſheweth there that Chriſt muſt be received by faith, and worſhipped in ſpirit and truth. And afterwards hee ſaith, *comprehenditur autem vera interior, & ſpiritualis veneratio & adoratio Chriſti*

page. 444. lines 2. 3. 4.

in his verbis institutionis. hoc facite, &c. for the true inward and ſpirituall worſhip of Chriſt, is comprehended in the words of Chriſts inſtitution, *Doe this in remembrance of me.* Now let the beſt minded Catholicks ſee your vniuſt dealing with both quick and dead, pretending that either *Chemnitius* (as you ſay) allowed your outward worſhip in your Sacrament, or that wee iarre amongſt our ſelues touching the ſame: which both bee vntrue. For you hold the worſhip to bee outward, bee and we inward: you carnall, he and we ſpirituall: and briefly, if you will yet read him diligently, you ſhall find he vtterlie condemneth your carnall preſence, and your externall worſhip, approoving the one to bee a fable, the other blaſphemie. And thus much for your ignorance touching *Martyn Chemnitius*, whom it ſeemeth you never ſaw, but onely tooke him by the eares, as Water-bearers do their Tankerds. Againe, you ſay, that *Chemnitius* vpon the aſſurance of the real preſence, approveth the cuſtome of the church in adoring Chriſt in the Sacrament, by the authoritie of Saint *Auguſtine*, *Ambroſe* in *Pſal.* 98. by *Euſebius Emiſſenus*, & Saint *Gregorie Nazianzen* charging as manie as doe the contrarie with impietie: to everie of which thus I anſwere.

This *Pſal.* according to the Hebrew is the 99 *Pſal.* and vpon this place S. *Auguſtine* writ, as I will alledge him of your *Paris* print: his words be theſe. *Qui de carne Mariæ, carnem accepit: & quia in ipſa carne hic ambulauit, &c. ipſam carnem nobis manducandam ad ſalutem dedit: Nemo autem illam carnem manducat niſi prius adorauerit:* which tooke fleſh of the fleſh of *Mary*, and becauſe in that fleſh he walked here vpon the earth, he gaue to vs that fleſh to eat to our ſalvation, for no man eateth that fleſh vnleſſe firſt he worſhip it. Now let vs examine this place, and ſee how that fitteth your purpoſe. Firſt, the fleſh of Chriſt that *Auguſtine* will haue worſhipped, muſt be thus conditioned, *Aug. in pſa. 98.*

1 First, it must be borne of the virgin *Marie*: b
yours was made of bread, and therefore not that t
flesh of Christ which *Augustine* speaketh of, and
not to be worshipped without ydolatrie.

2 Secondlie, that flesh of Christ which *August*
will haue vs worship, walked visiblie with his Chur
here vpon earth before Christs ascention. And vn
you can approoue vnto vs by canonicall warrant, su
a Christ in your Sacraments as walked vpon the ear
and died on the crosse, *Augustine* will not haue h
worshipped: which you shall never be able to doe d
ring the world.

3 Thirdlie, that flesh of Christ which *August*
will haue vs to worship, was given to vs for our s
vation, which I hope you will say (if you say truel
was actuallie, reallie, and in deed vpon the crosse. A
in the Sacrament misticallie, or by representation,
hath been prooved out of your owne bookes.

Thus you wrest that which *Augustine* spake of t
blessed flesh of Christ, to your fabulous supposed fle
made by a priest: whereby you wickedlie abuse t
learned father, and deceiue the simple Reader. For t
flesh of Christ which was conceived by the holie Gho
and borne of the blessed virgin, must be eaten with t
spirit, & adored with the spirit, as *Augustine* there spe
keth: and neither adored with your externall ap
worship, nor eaten with your corporall mouth. But
speake according to the Scriptures and Fathers, the v
rie eating of Christ, is the true adoring or worshippi
of Christ: because as he is eaten, so he is adored, b
he is eaten spirituallie by faith; therefore he is ador
spirituallie by faith. For faith is the chiefest braun
of Gods honour. Your next Author is *Ambrose* vp
the 98. *Psal.* which you imagine proveth your ext
nall worship of Christ in the Sacrament.

But Gentlemen, why deale you so vnrulie wi

heritage, in a matter of this importance? did
ose ever write vpon this place, I tell you no, Am-
deed writ vpon the *Psalmes*, till the end of the
ie one *Psal.* and there brake off, and reconti-
at the 118. *Psal.* but never writ of the 98. or 99.
. as you vntrulie deliver. For *Chemnitius* saieth
. In *Ambrosius, in eundem Psalmi versum inquit.*
n speaketh *Ambrose* vpon the same fifth verse of the *Tomo. 2.*
, adorate scabellum, worship yee his footestoole: *lib. de*
he saith not that *Ambrose* writ vpon that *Psalme*, but *spiritu-*
a verse of the *Psalme*, and not in that Tome, but *sancto*
nother, and yet not of a worship externall, as you *cap. 12.*
, but of a spirituall worship, such as Christ tea- *page. 157.*
th in the fourth of *Iohn.* For if you had read *Am-*
e you should haue heard him speak thus; *Hoc in loco*
piritual Christi adoratione, &c. In this place we will
ake one lie of the spirituall worship of Christ. So
rose vtterlie (if you had vnderstood him right he)
demneth your externall worship of Christ. But be-
se *Aug.* writing vpon this *Psal.* expoundeth *Ambrose*
opinion vpon that one verse, *adorate scabellum*, wor-
yee his foorstoole, &c. and both against your ex-
all worship, I will only desire you to read your own
gustine or your owne print, both thorowlie & deli-
atelie, and then I doubt not but you will see your
our, and reforme your iudgement. But now let vs
how fitlie you alleadge *Eusebius* to prooue your ex-
all worship of Christ in the sacrament.

Saint *Hierome* maketh mention of *Eusebius Emesenus* *Hieron.*
hop of *Emesa* in *Syria*, who writ in Greeke verie *de scriptor.*
rnedlie, and lived about the time of *Constantius*, a- *Eccles.*
out the yeare of our Lord 342. and was buried in *ast. in*
ntioche: yet some verie crasilie haue stitched certaine *Eusebio*
atten Homilies vpon this Greeke fathers sleeue, and *Emesseno*
rst vpon him a straunge wonder, in making him *Tom 1.*
eake Latten at least fiue hundred yeares after his *page. 396.*

death,

death, that was ignorant of the language during his life. But here I wil not take vpō me to dispusse whether this was *Eusebius Emesenus* the Syrian, or *Eusebius Emissenus* that *Canisius* saith was a Frenchman, *& hoc forte tempore claruit*, and peradventure (& peradventure not) florished at that time: or whether it was *Gratians Eusebius*. But this is most sure, that *Gratian* doth grace his Canon with his name, but which of them, anie, or none of them, it shall neither helpe nor hurt, because wee wil examine the matter, not the man. The Canon is this: *& cum reverendum Altare cibis spiritualibus ascendis satiandus, sacrum Dei tui corpus & sanguinem fide respice, honora maxime, totum haustu interioris hominis assume.* That is: and when thou commest to the reverend Altar to be fed with spirituall meates: looke vpon and consider with thy faith, the bodie and bloud of thy God, honour it with great reverence, and receiue the whole bodie with the swallow of the inward man.

Canisij cron. in Anno. 500.

Dist. 2. de consecr. canon quia corpus page. 432. in fine.

Your first decrees printed at Paris & your last at Louaine something differ in words & periods.

Now examine *Chemnitius* his doctrine and your opinion: he brings in this Canon to approoue the spirituall eating or worship of Christ in the Sacrament. And you alleadge it to make good your external *Tridentine* adoration of your breaden God. Behold, everie word of this your owne Canon is a witnesse against you, for the meat is spirituall, the man is spirituall, the manner is spirituall, the sight is spirituall, and the worship or honour is spirituall. Here is nothing corporall or outward, as you say, but all inward and spirituall, as we reach. And so to the next witnesse, which is *Gregorie Nazianzen*: his words bee these, *Invocabat Christum, &c.* she called vpon Christ that is worshipped on the Altar were the misteries are celebrated. I pray you what can you gather out of this to prooue your externall worship of Christ in the Sacrament, with cap, thumpe, and knee. *Gregorie* saieth, shee worshipped Christ, therfore you will conclude, it was your breaden

In Epitaphio Gorgoniæ sorenis suæ.

Christ.

Christ; too hastie a conclusion to be true. Or doe you thinke she worshipped Christ as inclosed in those mi-steries? Surelie no, for *Gregorie* saith it was in the darke night shee approached to the Altar. At which time there was neither prieste standinge by the Altar, misteries vpon the Altar, nor he (a) pixe hanging over the Altar, and therefore she worshipped Christ that was called vpon at the Altar, in the celebration of the misteries; not that hee was inclosed vnder the formes of those misteries, no more then the mountaine wherein the fathers worshipped, was either God substantiallie, or that God was inclosed in that mountaine vnder the formes and shapes of the mountaine. But the mountaine was the place where God was worshipped. And so the Altar was the place where Christ was called vpon and worshipped, not that Christ was there locallie by a corporall descention, but that he was worshipped there being called vpon and served with a spirituall ascention.

(a) *The Pixe was inuented by Innocentius 3. 1214. & Gregorie Naz. write Anno. 567. Ioh. 4. 20. Exod. 3. 12.*

And if you had read *Gregorie Nazianzen* a litle after, you should haue read that *Gorgonia* his sister, caried about her still some peeces of the figure of the sacred bodie and bloud of Christ, as it was the custome of that age: and with her repentant teares shee bedewed the same, not that she externallie honoured the same.

Here *Gregorie* calleth the Sacrament but a figure of the sacred bodie and bloud of Christ, therefore it had been ydolatrie to haue worshipped it. Yet notwithstanding your missaleadging and misvnderstanding of the premisses, as also your dissenting from Scriptures, Fathers, and auncient Popes, & irreligious dangerous iarres amonge your selues, you easily disburden your braines from further answere, thinking you haue confuted the protestants, & satisfied the Catholicks, and so strike vp your victorious *plaudite* in this maner; *So that the breed beeing of such agreement, vvee haue the lesse*

Esaias 42. 8.

occasion to embusie our braines to confute them.

Here Gentlemen you call vs a *brood*: we will take it in the best sence, for we confesse wee are Christ his *brood*, hatcht vnder the warmth of his mercifull wings, comming vnto him like hungrie chickens at the heavenlie clocke and call of his preaching ministerie to receiue that promised meat which indureth vnto everlasting life. And as for your pleasant Rhetoricall conceit expressed vnder this word *agreement*, it sheweth that in a merrie *mood* you haue not forgot all your *verball* tropes and *figures*. But when you can shew plainlie wherein the Protestants iarre amongst themselues, or dissent from the Scriptures and primitiue Church in matter of faith; then bestow vpon them these biting figures. In the mean time, (your iarres amongst your selues: nay your revoult from scriptures and all primitiue practise being made now so manifest to the Catholicks) it stands you vpon for the discharge of a good conscience, to confesse and recant them: for cure them you cannot. And thus much concerning your vnfortunate successe in alleadging some of our chiefe Protestants, as you terme them: And now to that which followeth.

Matth. 23. 37.

Ioh. 6. 27.

Antiphrasis.

For page. 586. *Acts & monuments.*

The five Articles established by all of Parliament. Anno 1540. *in the planting of the Protestants faith.*

Catho. Priests.

1 *That there is the reall presence of Christs naturall Bodie and blood in the Sacrament, under the formes of bread and wine.*

2 *That the communion vnder both kinds is not necessarie.*

3 *That Priests by the Lawe of God may not marrie.*

4 *That vowes of chastitie ought to be observed.*

5 *That Masses are agreable to Gods lawe, and profitfull.*

6 *That*

That confession is necessarie.

The foresaid Parliament, and everie one saying, publishing, preaching, teaching, disputing, or holding opinion against the first of these Articles, is adiudged a manifest (a) hereticke: and misbeleevers in the (b) rest rigorouslie punished.

(a) *was burnt & loste his Lands & goods as in case of highe Treason.*

(b) *They but loste life & goods as in case of Felonie, which was then a favour.*

GEntlemen, I expected that your proofes should haue ascended to the first fiue hundred years after Christs ascention, & now they descend so low, that there is small hope either of your recall or recoverie. I might iustlie take exceptions against this your Parliament proofe, because it is manie hundred yeares too young to prooue our matter in question; yet in respect it is an Act doue by all the Nobles and learned of the land, and least the Catholickes should thinke it vnannswerable, I am content to admit it, yet still keeping my ordinarie course, in examination of the proofes by Scriptures, Fathers, and the auncient Bishops and Church of Rome.

1 The first Article is sufficientlie confuted in the premisses alreadie handled. *1. Article.*

2 The second Article crosseth Christs blessed institution, and therefore is abhominable. And your Parliament saith, it is not necessarie to salvation to minister or receiue in both kinds, as Christ and his Apostles did. But you know there is a wofull curse pronounced by Gods spirit, against such as adde or detract to or from Christs Testament. And your owne Pope *Gelasius* laith flat sacriledge to their and your charge, for this your halfe communion, contrarie to Christs institution, saying: *Aut integra sacramenta percipeant aut ab integris arceantur, quia divisio vnius eiusdemque mysterij sine grandi sacrilegio non potest pervenire.* Either let them receiue the whole sacraments, or else let them bee kept backe from the whole, because the parting of one and the

2. Article.

Reuel. 22. 19.

Dist. 2. de consec. canon. Comperimus fol. 430.

the same misterie, cannot be done without great sacrilledge. The beginning of your Canon calleth this halfe communion *superstition*, and the latter part calleth it *sacrilledge*. Yet saieth your parliament proofe, the receiving in both kinds is not necessarie to salvation. Then I say, if it be not necessarie, why did Christ vse it? if we should not practise it, why did he command it?

Now if either Christs commaundement, *Hoc facite*, *Doe this*, or the Popes law can prevaile with you, follow Christ his institution: If you care for neither Christ nor Pope, then the Catholicks may see that you are Antichrists and Antipopes, and denie Christs written trueth, & the primitiue practise of the Church of Rome, and the best that you can make of your selues, is not ancient Romane Catholickes, but new vpstart Romish heretickes. And so to your third Article.

3. Article. 3 The third, *That priests by the lawe of God may not marrie.*

I may not here make anie stay, onelie touch a point or two and so away. This Article is contrarie to holie Scriptures, auncient fathers, the practise of the primitiue Church, and the Canons of the Popes. In the old Testament the marriage of the priests is recorded and commended.

Ierem. 1. 1. Exod. 18. Theholie Prophet *Jeremie* was the sonne of a priest. *Zippora* was the priest of Midians daughter, & married to *Moses* the Lords Maiestrate.

Luke. 1. 8. 9. Againe, in the new Testament *John Baptist* was the sonne of *Zacharie* a priest. And the Scriptures touching marriage giue rules without exception or limitation.

1. Cor. 7. 2. *To auoide fornication, let euerie man haue his wife, and euerie woman her husband.* And to the *Hebrewes* hee saith, *Marriage is honourable amongst all men, and the bed vndefiled, but whoremongers and adulterers God will iudge.*

Heb. 13. 4. And the same Apostle pointeth out to all posteri-

tie,

des, that the Authors and vpholders of this Article bee liers and hippocrits, and the forbidding of meates and marriage, to bee the doctrine of Divels. And this is onelie proper to the Church and Chaplens of Rome, as now they stand in the view of God, Angles, and men.

1 Tim. 4. 1. 2. 3.

Did not *Tertullian* write two bookes to his wife, in the first hee gaue direction vnto her toching his goods and possessions, if hee should die. In the second booke, directeth her in her Widdowhood, either to liue solelie serving the Lord, or else to marrie in the Lord. But in no case to marrie (as some did, for honour or ambition) with the Gentils. Who I praie you ever checkt or controlled him for so doing?

Tertull. page 422. & 427.

Ignatius the Martyr commendeth the Apostles and other ministers, *Qui operam dederunt nuptijs*, who ever blamed him for it? Nay, your owne Popes and Canons condemneth you and your parliament proofe. For thus they record to your disgrace: *Cum ergo & sacerdotibus nati in summos pontifices supra legantur esse promoti, non sunt intelligendi de fornicatione, sed de legitimis coniugijs nati, &c.* When therefore wee read that priests sonnes bee promoted to the Popedome, you must not thinke that they be bastards, borne in fornication, but sonnes borne in lawfull marriage: which marriage was lawfull for priests, before the late prohibition, and this day is lawefull still in the East Church.

Ad philadelphenses Epist. 5. page. 34. Dist. 56. Canon Cenomanensem fol. 67. Col. 4. & 68. col. 1.

Heere your owne Popes record that priests were married, and that their marriage was lawfull, and that Popes haue beene priestes sonnes bone in lawfull marriage. And that there was a prohibition to the contrarie, made by man. But no scripture or warrant from God.

Againe, there bee two other Canons of the Popes,

Dist. 28. siquis fol. 32. that will batter downe your papered rampiers of humane constitution; the first beginneth thus, *Si quis docuerit sacerdotem sub obtentu religionis propriam vxorem contemnere, Anathema sit*: If anie man teach that a Priest may contemne his wife vnder colour of religion, let him be accursed. And the second canon immediatlie followeth, which doth second this, *Si quis discernit presbyterum coniugatum tanquam occasione nuptiarum, quod offerre non debet, & ab eius oblatione ideo abstinet, Anathema sit*. If anie man iudge that a married Priest ought not to offer, (or to do his office) by reason of his marriage, and therefore abstaine from his oblation, let him be accursed.

dist. 31. Nicæna synodus fol. 34. Esdras. 1. cap. 4. 41. Beria in vita Malachia fol. 2. col. 4. about the yeares of our Lord 1130. *Paphnutius* also beeing but one man, confounded a whole Synode of your Bishops & learned men, as your Popes Records witnesse, and by Scriptures inforced them to subscribe that Priests marriage was lawfull. Heere you see *magna est veritas & prævalet*. Trueth is great (though in one against manie) and prevaileth.

And to come neere home vnto you with domesticall presidents: were not eight learned men, all of them immediat Archbishops of *Armachan* in this land, and all of them married? who vtterlie refused this tyrannicall and dyabolicall Romish yoke of forced single life. Nay in those daies the Nobilitie and Gentilitie of that Province defended that true religion with their swordes against the Pope, and they refused to receiue Orders, Bishoprickes, or Decrees from Rome. Whereuppon you may see that *Bernard* then in the Popes quarrell, calleth the Nobilitie and Gentility of that Province, *generationem malam & adulteram*, a wicked and adulterous generation, and saith it was *Diabolica ambitio potentum*, a divelish ambition of the Peeres and mightie men. And *execranda successio*, a cursed succession, that eight Bishops successiuelie all married (yet they all learned, and preached the Gospell and ministred the sacraments)

8. Immediat Lo. Archbishops.

dents) and yet neither they, the Nobilitie, nor Gentilitie, cared two pence for the Popes blessing or cursing. *O quantum mutantur ab illis?* O Lord, how farre is the Nobilitie and Gentilitie of *Vlster*, and that province, nay the most part of the kingdome chaunged from that olde Apostolicall religion, and become slaues and ideots in superstitious service to that late Italian priest the Pope, Gods enemie and the Queens butcher. Then they drew their swords against the Pope to defend the trueth: now too manie of late drew their swordes for the Pope against the truth. The Lord open their eies to see the truth, and giue them hearts to renounce this new heresie, & cleaue to the Apostolical Romane veritie. Then will all of them be as readie to fight the Lords battell against the Pope, as many of late fought the Queenes battell most honorably against the Spaniard. And that golde mouthed father *Chrisost.* vpon this place of *Paul. That a Bishop must be. the husband of one vvife*, asked this question, what mooved *Paul* thus to write to *Timothie?* he aunswereth himselfe saying, *obstruere prorsus intendit hareticorum ora qui nuptias damnant, ostendens, &c.* The Apostle intendeth to stoppe the mouthes of all heretick; that condemneth marriage, shewing that the thing in it selfe is faultlesse, and a thing so precious, *vt cum ipsa etiam possit quispiam ad sanctum Episcopatus solium subvehi*: that a man beeing married, may bee promoted to the holie function of a Bishoppe. And your Pope *Gregorie* saieth plainlie, writing *ad Theotistam Patricium*, that if marriage must be dissolved because of religion; *Sciendum est inquit*, yet saith he, you must vnderstand, *quia etsi hoc lex humana concessit. lex tamen divina prohibuit*, that if mans law graunt that, yet Gods law forbid, eth it.

of Armachan married.

Marke this ye Noblemen & Gentlemen of Ireland Imitate your Auncestors in true honour.

Chrysost. hom. 2. vpon first of Titus.

Now yee see Scriptures, Fathers, popes, practise of the primitiue Church, and presidents of godlie Bishops and priests witnesse with vs against you, that the mar-

riage

riage of priests is lawfull and honorable and your parliament stuffe vnlawfull and horrible? the one hath the warrant from Christ, the other is the doctrine of Diuels, from which recall your selues, your confederates and novices, least in abstaining from lawfull matrimonie, yee fall into damnable adulterie: which the Lord prevent for Christs sake. And thus much for the first three Articles.

4. Article. *4 That vowes of chastitie ought to be observed,*
5. Article. *5 That masses are agreable to Gods lawe,*
6. Article. *6 That confession is fruitfull.*

These three Articles are as repugnant to Christes truth, as the rest, The fift Article (Christ willing) in my next Treatise shall be handled, the fourth and sixth Article, as you hereafter giue occasion. Now let the Catholicks consider how vnmercifullie and vnmeasurablie, the bloudie Bishop of that Italian murthering Priest shed the innocent bloud of so manie Saints, because they would not say and subscribe that these fiue Articles (beeing in deed heretical) were Apostolicall and Catholicke. Was this the planting of the Protestantes faith? no, this parliament was established for no other end, but to supplant them. And therefore these fiue Articles were fitlie termed the whip with fiue strings, wherwith your forefathers whipt to death these innocent lambes (for neither conspiracie nor treason) but onelie for the word of God, and for the testimonie which they maintained. But they cease not to crie still for vengeance against those murtherers, saying: *How long Lord holie and true, doest not thou iudge & auenge our bloud on them that dwell on the earth?* But thankes be to God, those chanels of innocent bloud shed then in England by the Popes direction, haue quite for euer banish out of England the Pope & his superstition. And as the mother that would before *Salomon* haue the childe diuided, was not the true mother, so the Church

whip with fiue strings.

Reuel. 6. 10.

Church of Rome that delighteth so much in bloud, cannot be the true Church. Time will not permit to write the damnable fruit that this filthie Munkish chastitie yeeldeth: but of that when opportunitie is offered; yet stil nothing but what your own friends record. 1. Kings. 3.17. &c.

The fourth proofe.

Deniers of the reall presence condemned as heretickes. Catho. Priests.

Ignatius ad Smyrnenses, and Theodoret dialog. 3. circa medium, do make mention of certaine deniers of the reall presence: but so, as they had none to accord unto them. Also Iconomachi (as may appeare out of the 7 Councell) did affirme that the Sacrament was but an image of Christ: and they also had no followers: onelie Berengarius in the time of Leo the ninth, about fiue hundred yeares past, who abiure recanted such opinion as erroneous, maintained the onelie spirituall presence. And hee in three Councels was condemned, in Conc. Turon. sub Victor. 2. in Conc. Rom. sub Nich. 2. in Concil. Rom. sub Gregorio none. The Councell of Trent remaineth for the rest that haue insued.

GEntlemen, you should haue brought *Theodoret* before *Ignatius*, because *Theodoret* onelie reporteth some such thing out of *Ignatius* (but *Ignatius* himselfe hath not one word of it) and it seemeth still you never read *Theodoret*, because you say *circa medium*, not knowing in which of the three and thirtie chapters it was. To be briefe, that which you thinke maketh for you, is in the nineteenth chapter, which is but a sacramentall Metonymie, as the rest of the fathers vse; & you would wrest it to your litterall and proper sence; which is still your error spoken of & confuted before. But read *Theodoret dialog. 1. cap. 8.* & he will expound himself & confute you. And for *Ignat.* I haue read Rider.

his twelue Epistles vppon this occasion twice over, and from his first Epistle *ad Mariam Cassoboleten* to his last *ad Romanos*, there is no such thing in that reverend Archbishop and Martyr, but the contrarie: which maketh me to wonder with what conscience you can belie so godlie a Martyr, and abuse the Catholicks your loving friends. And as for your *Iconomachi*, they are verie impertinentlie brought in this place, your title of Images were more proper for them. Yet that you may see they fit not this purpose, I referre you for satisfaction to the Popes owne Synode and Decree, beginning at *Cum diem extremum impiorum Arabum Tyrannus quem Soliman nominabant, clausisset, &c.* and after followeth the Popes decree. *Petrus deuotissimus presbyter, &c.* Read this Act and Decree, and they will giue you satisfaction of your impertinent allegations: and if the Pope cannot content his Chaplens, then you are malecontents in deed.

Ex Synode 2. Act. 5. pag. 549.

Berengarius.

Lastlie, you bring in poore *Berengarius* vppon the stage, to beare his faggot and recant his error, of the spirituall presence of Christ in the Sacrament, which we haue sufficiently proved before to be (by scriptures, fathers, and Popes,) the true presence. And now you bring in silie *Berengarius* his recantation, to bee our confutation. I pray you let me aske you but one question: can a reason drawne from a perticular conclude generallie. If it should, I would reason thus with you: *Bonner, Standish*, wih others, preached stoutlie against the Popes supremacie in king *Edward* his dates: therefore the Popes Supremacie is not lawfull. Would you admit this kinde of reasoning, I thinke no: no more doe we the other. For shall one mans weaknesse, inconstancie, and fall from the trueth, conclude generallie against the trueth; God forbid. But you will obiect and say, it is not one man but three severall Synods. But I pray you remember that subornation of witnesses, and

These lurers be too young to giue evidence, and too partial.

and packing of Iuries done in Westminster Hall, it moſt ſeuerelie puniſhed in that moſt honorable Starre-chamber: and ſhall not the Pope and his followers be called to an account one day before the great iudge Ieſus, for the ſuborning of witneſſes and packing of corrupt Iuries to deface Chriſtes trueth, and to maintaine their owne forgeries? The Catholickes demand a prooſe out of Scriptures and fathers for the prooving of your Romane opinion touching Chriſts reall and corporall preſence in the Sacrament, and you bring in the Popes Stipendarie Chaplens gathered by the Popes ſummons to vphold the Popes rotten declining kingdome, and everie one of them at leaſt 1100. years after Chriſts aſcention, and one of them within this ſixtie yeares to prooue a thing done a thouſand years before. Now I giue Irelands Catholicks this friendlie caveat, not to cleaue to the Popes Romiſh religion, but to *Paules* Romane religion: & not to reſt contented with the name of Catholicks, vntill they haue the doctrine that is Apoſtolicall and Catholicke. And now to your fift prooſe, being your laſt refuge and leaſt helpe.

to be treated with the triall of this Iſſue.

The fift prooſe.

Of manie miraculous teſtimonies of the reall preſence.

Catho: Prieſts.

GEntlemen, you know in Schooles, *an ſit*, is ever before *quid ſit*: In architecture the foundation is before the building. In Chriſts divinity, mans philoſophie, and common ſence, the cauſe is ever before the effect. But you, contrarie to divinitie, reaſon, and philoſophie, will haue a thing to worke wonders *ſupra naturam*, aboue nature, which is not in *rerum natura*, neither hath anie beeing at all: for you would make the ſimple people beleeve, that your tranſubſtantiated Chriſt worketh miracles, and yet you haue

Rider.

not, nay you cannot prooue anie such a Christ, and if there were such a Christ, hee is none of ours: for hee was never borne of the blessed virgin, nor shed one drop of bloud for our sinnes, & therefore we renounce him as none of our Saviour.

It is straunge to see the difference of the old Church of Rome, and this last giddiepated Church of Rome. The last Church of Rome, thinketh that Church to be no true Church, vnlesse she worke miracles: but I pray you heare olde Romes censure of new Romes opinion, *Prater vnitatem & qui facit miracula* (a) *nihil est: in vnitate fuit populus Israel, & non faciebat miracula: praeter vnitatem erant magi Pharaonis & faciebant similia Moysi:* He that worketh miracles without the vnitie of the Church doth nothing: the Israelits were in the vnitie of the Church, and did no miracles: the Magicians of *Pharao* were out of the Church, & yet did like things to *Moyses*. Therefore true miracles such as *Moyses* wrought, may be done by such as are not members of the true Church, and so consequentlie miracles by olde Romes confession, prooue neither anie such wherein they are workt, to be the true Church, nor the workers true members of the same. And then it followeth: *Petrus Apostolus, &c.* Peter the Apostle wrought miracles, and so did *Simon Magus* manie things: yet there were manie Christians that coulde not worke miracles, as *Peter* did, or as *Simon* did, and notwithstanding they ioyced that their names were written in heaven.

Tars 2. decreti aurei cauſ. 1. Q. 1 page 119. Tenacious fraires.

(a) *Gloſſa Ibid: nihil ad vitam aternam,*

The olde Church of Rome taught vs to be aſſured of our ſalnation in this life.

Now for the Catholickes good, let vs examine the faith of old Rome. The children of Israell wrought no miracles yet the true Church: *Pharao* his Inchaunters worke miracles, yet were the false church. And that manie of Christs flocke that neither worke miracles as *Peter* did: yet they reioice for that they were assured that their names are written in the booke of life. And this much for your owne Pope against your owne miracles.

And

And doth not your owne Doctor *Lyra* tell you plainlie, that, *& similiter fit aliquando in ecclesia maxima deceptio populi in miraculis (b) factis a sacerdotibus vel eis adhaerentibus propter lucrum temporale, &c.* and so in like manner it commeth to passe, that sometimes in the Church the people are often most shamefullie cousoned with fained and false miracles devised by the priests or their followers, even for a temporall gaine; which shamefull shifts of cousoning and covetous priests, *Lyra* wisheth to be severelie punished by the chiefe Prelats, and to expell it and them out of the Church.

The new Church of Roome to doubt of our saluation in this life.

(a) *Vpon Dan. cap. 14. page 222. but Lyra printed at Venice hath.*

(b) fictis

(c) *Alex. de hales part. 4. quaest. 53. member. 4.*

And your owne (c) *Irrefragabilis* Doctour (for that is one of his titles) recordeth more speciall iugling then this, saying, *In sacramento apparet caro, interdum humana procuratione, interdum operatione diabolica.* In your very Sacrament of the Altar, there appeareth flesh, sometimes workt by the nimble conveiance of man, sometimes by the working of the divell; so that if there bee anie flesh in the Sacrament of the Altar, whether visible or invisible, it is either wrought through the priests legerdemaine, or the divels cunning and craft. Now Gentlemen, you haue brought your miracles to a faire market, I trust after a while the discreet Catholicks will not giue you a halfepennie for a hundred of them.

Tharasius the President of that ydolatrous Councell demaunded of all the learned in that Synode, why their images then did not worke miracles. Aunswere was made out of Gods booke, that *miracula non credentibus data sunt*: Miracles are onelie given to the vnbeleevers. If you bee too busie with your fained miracles, we will make a whole superstitious Synode yet to brand your Church and her children in the forehead for vnbeleefe.

Nycen. syn. 1. Act. 4.

And that reverend *Chrysostome* saith, *per signa cognoscebatur qui essent veri christiani, qui falsi: Nunc autem signorum operatio omnino leuata est: magis autem inuenitur apud eos qui falsi sunt christiani.*

Crysost. Hom. 49. in math.

In old time it was knowne by miracles, who were the true Christians, and who were the false. But now the working of miracles is taken away altogither, and is rather found amongst those that bee false disguised Christians. Note but two things out of *Chrysostome*: First, miracles are now quite taken away: Next, onely they remaine with false Christians in the false Church: so if your Church will haue miracles, by *Chrysostomes* censure she is a false Church, and all in that Church be false Christians. But if your miracles were true, as all Gods and Christs miracles are, then the change must be as well of the formes as of the substances. When *Moses* rod was turned into a serpent, it was a serpent in deed, and no likenesse of a rod remaining. And so when Christ turned water into wine, there was neither colour nor taste of water remaining, & so in all true miracles. But you would haue in your Sactament, a change of the substance of bread, yet the accidents, as whitenesse, roundnesse, thinnesse, taste, and relish, notwithstanding remaining, which is impossible, and not onelie contrarie to the word of God, but also to the faith of those primitiue fathers. And *Augustine* vrgeth this matter verie Evangelicallie, saying: *Quisquis ad hus prodigia, vt credat inquirit, magnum est ipsum prodigium, qui mundo credente non credit.* Whosoever hee bee that yet requireth wonders and miracles, to bring him to beleeue the truth, is himselfe a wonderfull miracle, that the world beleeving, yet hee remaineth still in vnbeleefe. And *Augustine* else where telleth you flatlie, that in the Sactament of the Lords Supper there is no miracle: read him and follow him. And this is not to passe vntoucht, that as your miracles are false in themselues, so they are invented and done to a most wicked end, which is to confirme your false doctrine of reall presence, Purgatorie, praying to Images, and the like trash, which are clean contrarie to Christs miracles:

Exod. 4. 3.

Iho. 2. 9. 10.

These proeue your miracles to be false.

August. de civitate dei lib. 22. cap. 8. line. 3. 4.

August. de Trinitate lib. 3. cap. 10.

for their end was twofold: the first, to confirme our faith in Christs divinitie; and the other, to assure our soules of salvation through his name. *These things are written, that you might beleeue that Iesus is that Christ the Sonne of God, and that in beleeuing you might haue life through his name.* Ioh. 20. 30 31

Eusebius recounteth, that in the persecution vnder Seuere, that it was a great accusation against Christians, that they did eate mans flesh, because they beleeued that they did receiue the bodie of Christ. Catho. Priests. lib. 5. cap. 1.

GEntlemen, in that booke are fiue and twentie chapters, and not one word of this matter in anie of those: and againe, you mistake the time, for *Seuerus* then gouerned not. If it were vnder *Seuerus*, it should then be in the fifth booke, where you shal finde fortie fiue chapters, yet there also is not one word of this. Yet if you marke this that you bring against vs, if it were to be found in *Eusebius*, it maketh nothing against vs: for though the Pagans were as grosse in the matter of the Sacrament, as *Nicodemus* was in the matter of regeneration, it is neither miracle nor wonder, but a thing too common now and then. And for true Christians to eate Christes flesh spiritually by faith, is or ought to be no miracle in the Church, but the practise of the Church. But if you had read *Eusebius* your selfe diligently, you should haue found that in the fifth booke and seuenth chapter, hee would haue tolde you that these miracles ceast, & were not in Gods Church; and he produceth old Father *Irenæus* for confirmation of the same. You bring in *Eusebius* to maintaine miracles, and *Eusebius* himselfe denieth them. This is your olde fashion, to inforce the fathers to speake not what they would, but what you please: but read that place well, and remember that *Eusebius* records that Church Rider, Ex lib. 2. Irenæi. cap 58.

wherein

wherein miracles are wrought, not to be Gods churche and so by his opinion your Church of Rome must bee planted in the suburbs of *Babylon*, not (in *Civitate Dei*) within the gates of *Sion*.

Catho. Priests. *Amphil. & Guitmund. de vita Basilij.* Rider.

A Iew present at masse, which Saint Basil did celebrate, was converted by seeing a childe deuided in the blessed Sacrament.

I Finde in *Basil* pag. 372. that he writ thirtie chapters *ad sanctum Amphilochium Icanij Episcopum*, but your Munkish *Amphilochius* I never saw, neither doe I care, because he is a forger of false miracles, and thus I proove it. The fabler saith, the Iew saw a childe deuided in the sacrament: that could not be Christ, for hee was a perfect man before his passion. And if it were anie besides Christ, or if it had been anie in Christ his likenesse, it must be done as your owne Authour said a little before, either by mans sleight, or the divels illusion. But to be briefe and yet plaine, this must needes be a verie shamefull lie: For how could *Basil* that lived about the yeare of our Lord 367. say your masse, that was in hatching vp and patching togither at least foure hundred or fiue hundred yeares after his death? as shall (God willing) bee prooved vnto you out of your owne bookes, in my next Treatise of the masse: and so you feed the Catholickes with these lying legends, instead of holie scriptures.

A lier hath need of a good memorie.

Tom. 6. Basilieth. patrum in lib. Guitmundi Archiep. de veritate Euch. B. 2. pag. 405

(a) As for *Guitmundus*, he hath neither one word of Saint *Basils* life, nor of your miracle, yet hee hath some other thing as foolish and as vntrue, or else he had not been made Archbishop for his paines, wherein he greatlie serviced the Pope.

Cath. Pri. *Amb. oratio. 1. de obit. Satyri.*

Ambrose speaketh of a happie preservation of eus from drey vsing, for devotion towards the same.

In deed

IN deed *Ambrose Tom. 5. pag. 720.* writeth a treatise of the death of his brother *Satyrus*, wherein he sheweth the great mercie of God alwaies towards his Church and children in preserving them from daunger: and amongst the rest, hee bringeth in an example of a great number of passengers that in a storme suffered shipwracke, amongst whom there was one seeing the daunger, desired of some fellow passenger, to giue him some part of the misticall bread (for in those daies it was a superstitious custome wickedlie tollerated, to carrie some part of the sacramentall bread about them) which peece of bread when hee had inclosed fast in his garment, he leapt over boord and did swimme safe a shore. This now is your wonderfull miracle, out of which let vs see what may be gathered. The best note (saith a learned writer) is, that he was a good swimmer. But to overthrow your miracle, I will alleadge *Ambrose* his owne words in that place: First, he calleth it but onlie *fidei auxilium*, a helpe of his faith. And if hee had thought it had beene Christ, as you vntrulie teach, hee would haue called it the Authour and finisher of his faith, and therefore he tooke your Oste not to bee his maker, as you teach, nor his present preserver, but a strengthening of his faith. And that you may see it is true which I say, afterwards he calleth it *Divinum fidelium sacramentum*, the divine Sacrament of the faithfull. And therefore he thought not as you doe, that Christ was locallie in the sacrament.

Rider.

So simple people foolishlie carry about them hallie bread, Crosses, Crucifixses, agnus dies, & such trash

And againe, there was no miracle in this, because other passengers that had not such misticall bread, escaped safe to shore as well as he: for if the having of that Host preserved him, the lacke of the Host should haue drowned the rest. And it is verie straunge that the Catholicks being so wise men in all other matters, should be so sotted in this, as to thinke that a Wafercake consecrated by a Priest or Pope, should preserue a man

If your hoste cannot doe the lesser

much lesse the greater.

from drowning in water, when it cannot preserue anie good fellow from being drunke with wine. But to the rest as they follow.

Catho. Priests, *lib* 8. *cap.* 5.

Sozomen recounteth how a woman not beleeving that Christ had transformed bread into his bodie, was in danger by transformation of bread into a stone.

Rider.

SOme such thing there is, but you misse *Sozomens* words, sentences, and purpole, and applie it still to your Host. The priest told *Sozomen*, that in giving the Sacramentall bread to a woman, shee tooke it in her hand, and privilie gaue it her maide behinde her: which the maid no sooner toucht with her tooth, but it turned into a stone, & the print of the tooth is this day to be seen in *Constantinople*. I pray you Gentlemen, is this your Oste Christs bodie? if it be as you teach, (but fie, it is a false lie) then were Christs bodie turned into a stone, & to be seen at *Constantinople* vnder the forme of a stone, as well as at Rome vnder the formes of bread. O hellish divinitie: but I say vnto you Priests & Iesuits, as *Paul* said to that false Arch-Iesuit *Barjesus*: *O full of all subtiltie and mischiefe, children of the devell, and enemies of all righteousnesse, will yet not cease yet to pervert the straight waies of the Lord, but still like* Elimas *seeke to turne Christs flocke from Christs faith?*

Beleeue it that list.

Acts. 13. 10.

Catho. Priests. *Crantzius lib.* 5 *cap* 9

And a certaine Duke of Saxonie vpon a like occasion did become a christian.

Rider.

ALbertus Krantzius *Hamburg:* (you misspell his name) writes *chronica Regnorum, Daniæ, Suetiæ, & Norwagiæ*, I haue read diligentlie the ninth chapter of everie fifth booke of these three histories, and there is no such thing in anie of them: therfore you are to blame still to abuse learned men to bee the Au-

thours

thours of these fables: and the Catholickes most of all, to beleeue these fables.

Optatus reporteth a grieuous punishment of abusers of a sacred Host.

Catho. Priests.

OPtatus in deed speaketh of two professed Donatists, *Vrbanus Formensis* and *Felix Idunensis*, who comming into the countrie of *Mauritania*, and entring the Churches at the time of the celebration of the holie communion, commanded (*Eucharistiam*) the Eucharist to be given to their dogs, but the dogges growing mad presentlie, set vppon their owne maisters, and rent their flesh with their teeth. A iust iudgement of God for their vile attempt of so holy misteries. But how dare you say that this was your consecrated Host? *Optatus* saith it was (*Eucharistia*) the Eucharist, that is to say, the whole misteries of thanksgiving (and not a part) which was cast vnto dogges: but *Optatus* saith not that Christ was locallie inclosed in that bread. And you stil continue your wonted course, that whersoever you finde this word *Ecclesiam*, it is your Church: and where you finde this word *Eucharistiam*, that is your consecrated Osse. But alasse, you deceaue the Catholickes, for you haue neither the true Church (because yee lacke the sincere preaching of Gods word, and the lawfull vse of his two sacraments, which be the two vnfallible markes of Christs Church) nor yet haue you Christs sacraments as hee left to his Church; but as they are disguised and prophaned by the late Church of Rome, which doth as far differ from the primitiue practise of the auncient Church of Rome, as Christs institution differs from mans invention.

Optatus lib. 2. contra Donatist. Rider.

Read Gregorie Nazianzen in his funerall sermon of father, mother, and sister, and you shall finde miraculous demonstrations of the reall being of Christ.

Catho. Priests.

W a You

Rider. YOu still abuse the eares of the simple: *Gregorie* hath no such matter as you speake of, wrought by your charmed Hoste: If you mean the spiritual reall *being* of Christ in your sacrament, that is none of yours: and if you mean of your corporall *presence* of Christ, alasse, *Gregorie* never knew it. But Gentlemen, you are to blame to vrge these fables to prooue a matter of faith: you haue alleadged nothing that will weaken your cause more then this. But if you wil haue the world to beleeue your miracles, you must giue over these iugling trickes, and shewe vs what sicke man by your Hoste you haue made sound: out of whom you haue cast divels: what Serpents you haue touched (as *Paul* did) and yet were not stung: which of you haue drunke drinke deadlie poisoned, and were not killed: which of you speake with new tongues, that were never by time nor Tutors taught? vnlesse you can doe these miracles, the Catholicks must esteem you no better then iuglers: And yet by your leaue, if you could doe all these and more to, vnlesse your doctrine be answerable to Christ his trueth, the Apostle will account you accursed: and we must not beleeve you.

This Gregorie vvas dead 500. yeares before your corporall presence vvas knowne.

Acts. 28. 5

Marke.

Galath. 1. 9.

Catho. Priests. *I trust this vvill suffice for averring the consent of the Catholickes, vvith the fathers of the primitiue Church vvhich is the first Article we were provoked to prooue.*

Rider. I Know you are vtterlie deceived, and I trust, this wil suffice the godlie learned and indifferent Reader, that you & your late Romish Catholicks quite dissent frō Christs truth & old Romes religion: & therfore [illegible] from whence yee are fallen, and returne to [illegible] (while God giues you time) which [illegible] &c.

FINIS.